

**Yuri Alimov**



**The Rise  
and Growth  
of the  
Non-Aligned  
Movement**

**To the Blessed Memory of  
Jawaharlal Nehru and  
Indira Gandhi**

**"They did much for the  
rise and development of  
the non-aligned  
movement as an  
important positive  
factor in the present-  
day world."**

***Mikhail Gorbachev***

**Yuri Alimov**

**The Rise  
and Growth  
of the  
Non-Aligned  
Movement**



Progress Publishers

Moscow

Translated from the Russian by *Vitaly Baskakov*

Designed by *Alexander Mokhin*

**Юрий Алимов**

**Движение неприсоединения: история и современность**

*На английском языке*

© Progress Publishers 1987

*Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*

A-0801000000-569 35-87  
014 (01)-87

## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	7
I. A HISTORY OF NON-ALIGNMENT .....	12
<i>Chapter One.</i> Peace Is Valued Most by Those Who Have Been Through War .....	13
<i>Chapter Two.</i> Choosing a Political Course During Cold War Years .....	19
1. Nehru's Philosophy of Non-Alignment .....	22
2. The First Solidarity Conferences .....	27
<i>Chapter Three.</i> Bandung 1955 .....	32
<i>Chapter Four.</i> Belgrade 1961 .....	40
<i>Chapter Five.</i> From International Conferences to Interna- tional Unity .....	48
II. ASSOCIATION OF NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES—A NEW INSTITUTION IN THE HISTORY OF INTERNA- TIONAL RELATIONS .....	59
<i>Chapter One.</i> The Mechanism of the Non-Aligned Move- ment .....	63
1. The Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries .....	64
2. The Coordinating Country and the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement ..	65
3. Conferences and Meetings of Foreign Ministers .....	67
4. The Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN and the Coordinating Bureau of the Movement .....	70
5. Permanent Bodies, Working Groups and Ad Hoc Committees .....	76
6. Specialized Bodies .....	79

<i>Chapter Two.</i>	The Procedure of Operation of the Non-Aligned Movement and Its Bodies . . . . .	83
	1. Participation in the Non-Aligned Movement and Representation at Its Forums . .	84
	2. The Procedure for Fixing the Venue and Time of Summit Forums, and for Setting Up the Coordinating Bureau and Its Operation . . . . .	88
	3. Preparations for Summit and Ministerial Forums . . . . .	89
	4. Decision-Making Procedure . . . . .	91
III. WHAT UNITES THE NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES . .		99
<i>Chapter One.</i>	On the Way from the Past to the Future . .	100
	1. Myths and Reality . . . . .	101
	2. Anachronisms of the Colonial System of Oppression and Exploitation . . . . .	104
<i>Chapter Two.</i>	Non-Aligned Movement: Goals, Principles and Positions . . . . .	113
	1. General Goals and Principles of Non-Alignment . . . . .	114
	2. Non-Aligned Positions on Major International Issues . . . . .	119
IV. THE MOVEMENT AND POLICY OF NON-ALIGNMENT: A TEST OF STRENGTH . . . . .		140
<i>Chapter One.</i>	Non-Alignment at the Time of World Tensions and the Economic Crisis of the 1980s . . . . .	142
	1. The Vital Interests of Non-Aligned Countries Threatened . . . . .	143
	2. Variations of the Policy of Non-Alignment . . . . .	150
	3. "Genuine Non-Alignment" . . . . .	160
<i>Chapter Two.</i>	...But the Caravan Goes Its Own Way . . . .	173
	1. Does the NAM Need Allies? What Are They? . . . . .	174
	2. The NAM Is Growing Stronger . . . . .	192
	3. The Harare Conference—A Case for New Political Thinking . . . . .	202
Conclusion . . . . .		222

## **I n t r o d u c t i o n**

The increased tensions provoked at the turn of the 1980s by yet another fit of US hegemonic ambitions have set off a tide of worldwide concern for the future of international relations. The threat of nuclear war is growing, making the alignment of world forces and political opportunities to avert the impending holocaust most topical issues.

Considering the balance of strength in the world today, the situation at present and in future largely depends on the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. However, the alignment of world forces is no longer considered only in terms of the balance of the potentials of the two great powers, and world politics is no longer their monopoly. Experience tells us that major international problems often arise and are solved with other countries taking a direct part in this process.

This is true also of the newly-free countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania. And not only because they make up two-thirds of the states in the world, but also because dangerous conflicts erupting mostly in these regions affect the rest of the world, worsening the international situation, tense as it is today. Therefore, the war and peace issue, the main issue of our time, cannot be solved without the newly-free countries taking part.

In the present system of international relations, which began to take shape after World War II, there have appeared new factors and trends. A new feature in the relations among various countries is the increasing number of international governmental and non-governmental organizations and conventions. The newly-free countries have been quite active in this process. Moreover, due to their

accelerated political development they found a way to unity much quicker than, for instance, the European capitalist states did.

Practically every developing country has joined several or, at least, one or two associations. Some of the associations have become significant elements in the present-day system of international relations. The major ones among them are the non-aligned movement, the Group of 77, the Organization of African Unity, the Organization of Islamic Conference, the League of Arab States, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and some others.

The composition of these associations is all too diverse and not only disputes but also wars erupt among their member countries, the Iran-Iraq war being the latest instance. Still, in their international activities they normally come to terms on many international issues. As a result, these associations, their opportunities being limited as they are, prove quite efficient for their members.

All this is most important for the nascent states, since the traditional means of international influence, such as military and industrial potentials, as compared with industrialized countries, are too inadequate, yet. So they can increase their role in world politics only by pooling their efforts. Due to their joint actions and vigorous foreign-policy activity, a solution of any global problem cannot be considered lasting unless their common interests and views are taken duly into account. This combination of the unity, vigorous activity and international influence of the newly-free countries is one of the main features in the evolution of the modern system of international relations.

The big changes that occurred in this system after World War II resulted, among other things, in the emergence of the non-aligned movement (NAM), which was a logical outcome of the national liberation revolution at its new stage or, as the Third Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries formulated it, "the product of the world anti-colonial revolution and of the emergence of a large number of newly-liberated countries".<sup>1</sup>



In a relatively brief span of time the non-aligned movement spread wide across Asia and Africa, extending to part of Latin America and Western Europe, and spilled over into Oceania. With about one hundred countries in it, that is, most of the newly-free states, the movement keeps growing. One of the largest international associations, it becomes ever more active politically, exerting a substantial impact on the evolution of international relations.

More than once in the past years Western statesmen and journalists who could not tolerate the political independence of non-aligned countries set out to smear the foreign-policy course of these countries and forecast an inevitable collapse of the NAM. A great deal was done in the West to change the political orientation of the movement, to split it and then to eliminate it altogether. These actions were resumed before each non-aligned summit and are often undertaken today.

But, surprisingly, neither financial, economic, diplomatic and propaganda pressure of imperialism, nor political differences, nor even armed clashes between non-aligned countries themselves could damp down their common striving for independence and unity, the striving based on common interests. For all the social, economic, political, ethnic, religious, and language differences, the association of these countries proved viable. What is more, the past decades of the NAM's history have shown that its development is a stable and logical historical process.

The role of the NAM in world politics and its international prestige have been growing. Today, when all nations are alarmed over the future of security and peace, the NAM has been generally recognized as a major contingent of the anti-war forces which are the source of hope for the peace-loving public the world over.

No wonder, then, that even at present, when international conferences open almost every day, only few of them attract so much attention as the non-aligned summits which examine major political issues of vital significance for non-aligned and all other countries. The NAM's first summit conference, opened on September 1,

1961, in Belgrade, went down in history. It is not just remembered by people but is significant for them today, because the policy of non-alignment and the movement itself are developing. September 1 is marked ever since by the countries in the movement as the Non-Alignment Day.

Yet, the non-aligned movement, which is a new and outstanding phenomenon in the history of international relations, has too many unknown quantities in it. This accounts for the heated debates over what policy the non-aligned movement should pursue and what its position and actions should be, especially before and during its summit conferences.

The debates are focused on questions that seem quite simple: Non-alignment with whom and why? Whom or what should the movement combat? What should be the pivot of non-alignment—resolute anti-imperialism and cooperation with the world anti-imperialist forces or “equidistance from the blocs” and complete dissociation from the policy of any of them? These questions confronted the pioneers of non-alignment from the outset and continue to affect the unity of many non-aligned nations at their meetings. The answers would determine the role of the movement in the world and its influence on world processes and developments.

No clear-cut answers to these significant questions have been formulated so far in the movement. Those who have attempted to give them either underestimate or overestimate the role of the movement in present-day history; sometimes non-alignment is also understood as a “third way” in world politics, and is termed “genuine non-alignment”. It all depends on who gives an answer.

Evidently, the different answers reflect a conflict of various forces and trends within the non-aligned movement. The main two trends reflect the anti-imperialist and “equidistant” views. If one sees clearly which of them is objectively more stable and prevails in the NAM's practical activities, the answer will perhaps be most precise. And one has to examine the movement in a specific historical context and study its origin and evolution not in isolation from the world processes and events but

against their background.

"The interrelations and interdependence of nations have grown tremendously in recent years, and the world is becoming, in many ways, a single unit. History has become international, a world history, and can only be understood even as regards one country if we keep looking at the world as a whole," wrote Jawaharlal Nehru, the great patriot of India, in a letter to his daughter Indira Gandhi.<sup>2</sup> This is the approach which can result in a thoroughly considered assessment of both the policy and movement of non-alignment, their role in the world today and the real alignment of opposed forces in it.

Besides, the NAM also has conflicting centripetal and centrifugal tendencies. This makes one wonder if the movement is strong enough and in what direction it is developing as an international association. It is therefore important to know how the movement keeps going, and what its setup, its mechanism, and procedure of work are. The answer may give a clearer picture of the future of this unusual institution in the system of international relations.

In this book the author will try to answer the questions posed by life, including the most acute ones, and hopes it will come in handy for the reader, both in theoretical and in practical terms.

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents of the Gatherings of the Non-Aligned Countries 1961-1982*, Published by Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi, 1983, p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru, *Glimpses of World History*, The John Day Company, New York, 1942, p. 842.

# I

## A HISTORY OF NON-ALIGNMENT

To give an unbiased assessment of any phenomenon in life, especially in international affairs, one should have a clear idea not only of the phenomenon itself, but also of its origin, of what preceded it and what happened later. This fully applies to the non-aligned movement which has its own history but has been unfolding against the background of international developments.

The origin of this new phenomenon in the system of international relations can be traced to the revolutionary changes caused in the system by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. The revolution marked the beginning of the end of the international relations which prevailed in the world before 1917. The next major change in international relations occurred after World War II, when the socialist community emerged and demonstrated the possibility of applying in practice the principles of equality, fraternal cooperation and comradesly mutual assistance among free peoples.

The example of the socialist countries could not, of course, remain unnoticed in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. India and other freedom-loving states that had emerged after the collapse of colonial empires, accepted and applied many of the foreign-policy principles used by the USSR and the socialist community as a whole, since these principles met their own interests.

But their own experience was doubtlessly of primary importance to these nations which for decades, if not centuries, had languished in colonial bondage. Precisely this explains why after winning independence they refused to be bound to the world policy of the former met-

ropolitan countries and chose non-alignment as the chief principle of their foreign relations.

It is appropriate in this context to recall how many of them fought in World War II which had been started by the imperialists.

### ***Chapter One. Peace Is Valued Most by Those Who Have Been Through War***

If one compares the list of non-aligned countries with the list of the countries that participated one way or another in World War II, they will be very much alike. This concerns both the countries with a prewar record of independence and those which were colonies or semi-colonial territories during the war.

Among them was Ethiopia, the first victim of aggression. Already before World War II, in 1935, Ethiopia was attacked and seized by fascist Italy. To the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis this was a rehearsal for executing aggressive plans.

Hitler planned to turn the whole of Africa into a German dominion. Hermann Goering dreamed about making Madagascar an ideal unsinkable German aircraft carrier. On February 17, 1941, Hitler ordered the start of preparations for invading India, Iran and Afghanistan through Soviet Transcaucasia. At the same time, secret talks were under way between Germany and Japan on dividing South Asia. Japan, for its part, openly sought the creation of a Great Co-Prosperity Sphere in East Asia, under Japanese administration, of course.

The setting up of the anti-Hitler coalition during World War II, which had started in 1939, blocked the aggressors' advancement from Europe to Oceania. But the war did come in a broad front to Asia, to Africa and to the islands in the Mediterranean and Oceania. The whole of Yugoslavia, and countries in North and East Africa and Southeast Asia became veritable battlefields. The war came close to the Latin American shores.

To enlist the support of dependent and colonial peo-

ples, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Winston Churchill solemnly declared already in August 1941 in their famous Atlantic Charter that after the war the United States and Britain would respect the right of all nations to choose the form of government of their own free will. At the Brazzaville Conference in 1944, France Libre, too, announced a forthcoming democratization of political activity in its colonies. All these promises were deliberately vaguely worded and did not in the least mean a voluntary renunciation of colonial rule. Anyway, they made it easier for Britain, France and the USA to raise the dependent and colonial peoples against nazi Germany and its allies.

At the beginning, however, not all of these peoples could see in the Japanese, Italian and German invaders new colonialists longing to take the place of the old ones. Wishing to free themselves from the hated colonial and semi-colonial regimes installed by European countries, some African countries were reluctant to support the anti-fascist coalition, for it included colonial powers. In some of the countries the anti-colonial forces even contacted the self-styled "liberators" and helped their troops, but gradually, after the "liberators" exposed themselves, they began to see the light. Thousands of patriots in Burma, Indonesia, Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, Vietnam, Malaya, the Philippines, Libya, Sudan, and other countries rose against the invaders and formed guerrilla units. Organized armed resistance continued in Korea and Ethiopia. The resistance movement in Asia and Africa became part of the anti-fascist front.

At that time, the future members of the non-aligned movement—India, Cuba, Nicaragua, Panama and Yugoslavia—officially joined the United Nations which signed the Washington Declaration on setting up the anti-fascist coalition on January 1, 1942. They were later acceded by many countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania to make up the majority of its members.

Most important, however, is that some of these countries greatly contributed to the common victory of the anti-Hitler coalition. Small Yugoslavia formed the People's Liberation Army in the rear of the German invaders.

After long and stubborn battles it liberated almost the whole of the country and, aided by the Soviet Army, freed Belgrade and fully restored national independence. This was by far not the only instance of the peoples of the countries known today as non-aligned taking direct part in military operations during World War II.

The troops from Afro-Asian countries fought as part of the British, American and French forces and contributed to many of the victories scored by those forces. The largest contingent was provided by India which added to the British army 2.5 million troops in the land forces, 30,000 in the air force and 30,000 in the navy. The Indian army was the backbone of the 3.2-million strong force mobilized by Britain in its colonies. That amounted to one-third of the total strength of the British armed forces. The Indian units defended India and fought courageously in Southeast Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa and in Europe.

In some battles the troops from the dependent countries of Asia and Africa played a decisive role. During the liberation of Ethiopia, for instance, Indians were in the majority in the British army, and it was mainly due to the Indians that the Italian troops were routed in Ethiopia. The situation was much the same in the Philippines, where 75,000 Philippine and 9,000 American soldiers held back for several months the 300,000-strong army of the Japanese aggressors and so prevented them from invading Australia.

Most of the Afro-Asian countries had a colonial or semi-colonial status during the war and formally were not counted as its participants. But that made no difference, in fact. Britain and France, for instance, called up about 3 million, among them nearly 1 million privates, in their African domains.

African military aid was most significant for France, for there were more Africans than the French in the army of France combattante all along, right up to the liberation of Paris.

Besides, the USA, Britain and France built in their dependent countries numerous military bases and strong points. The USA had such bases in Panama, Jamaica,

Trinidad, on the Bahamas, in Morocco and in Liberia. All in all, it had 256 bases in the Pacific and 228 in the Atlantic during the war. Britain had a few dozen bases in the Mediterranean and in the Red Sea, in the countries of the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, Africa and Oceania. Panama, Egypt, Iran and Iraq provided vital communications for the USA and Britain.

But that was not all. The future non-aligned countries acquired special significance during the war also because military production was expanding there and their strategic raw materials were used by the American and British war industries. The dependent countries largely contributed to the solution of the food problems the USA, Britain and France were facing at the time.

Like all nations that took part in that war, Yugoslavia, India and other future non-aligned countries incurred heavy losses. Yugoslavia alone lost 1,700,000 people. The number of Africans killed in the war was incalculable.

A closer examination of the losses suffered by the dependent countries shows that by far not all of them had been caused directly by the enemy. The high mortality rate in the colonies caused by famine was largely accounted for the excessive demands of the colonial authorities for food deliveries from those countries, the needs of the local population being totally ignored. Food was taken away from the hungry natives by force.

The colonialists robbed the colonial and dependent countries without scruple, making them pay for most of their war spending. Britain was the harshest in this respect.

The British Ministry of Information said that by the start of 1944 Britain extracted over £18 million from its colonies and mandated territories—South Rhodesia, East Africa, West Africa, Ceylon, Malta, Cyprus and others. And it “borrowed” from them material resources costing a good deal more than that. According to Jawaharlal Nehru, in the first five years of World War II Britain squeezed from India a sum which by far exceeded all British investments in India over the preceding 100 years or more.



One would expect Britain, the United States, France and other colonial powers duly to appreciate the big share of the dependent countries, colonies and semi-colonial territories in the combat victories and in the maintenance of their armies during World War II. But their contribution was forgotten before the war ended. This was obvious already at the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations held in April through June 1945, at which the contribution was mentioned only by representatives of the dependent countries themselves.

The struggle of the Americans, the British and the French against Italian and German fascism and Japanese militarism and the losses they suffered have been highly honoured by mankind. But this does not mean that the great role of other nations in the common victory of the anti-Hitler coalition should be ignored. It would be only fair to do credit to the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania for their role in the successes scored by the armed forces of Britain, France and the United States.

The "gentleman's" attitude of the colonial powers to these countries and their peoples who had helped these powers and had suffered a great deal, was manifest when the reparations issue was debated. At the Potsdam Conference in 1945 the winners signed an agreement on recovering from Germany reparations by confiscating its industrial equipment, delivering commodities from Germany and using the German work force. Under the agreement, the reparation claims of the USA, Britain and other countries entitled to reparations, had to be fully satisfied at the expense of West Germany and its external assets.<sup>1</sup>

The USA, Britain and France took out of West Germany numerous patents, a huge amount of equipment, gold and various goods. The Western powers must have shared the reparations they received with the dependent and colonial countries which had helped their armies. But they appropriated all of it themselves. The colonies and semi-colonies received no compensation for the losses and damage they suffered during the war. What is more, the metropolitan countries did not pay them even what they had borrowed from them.

Even a partial compensation would be very helpful in rehabilitating and developing the economies of the dependent countries. But they wanted far more than compensation—they wanted freedom.

Fighting side by side with British, French and American soldiers and inspired by the stubborn liberation struggle and victories of the Soviet people, the peoples of Asia and Africa became aware of their strength and could no longer tolerate their lawless position. Having suffered heavy losses during the war, including numerous deaths caused by famine and disease, the countries of Asia and Africa did not want to depend any longer on the colonial powers and on their policies. The Indian National Congress declared in June 1945 that international peace and a new world order could be ensured solely by recognizing the freedom of the oppressed nations and by wiping off any trace of imperialist domination over them. That statement of the INC reflected the aspirations of the Afro-Asian peoples as well.

The fact that the Soviet Union, which has always sided with the anti-colonialist forces, was among the winners in World War II, proved very helpful in meeting these aspirations. Whether its Western allies in the anti-Hitler coalition wanted it or not, they were unable to prevent the growth of the international position and prestige of the USSR which had played a decisive part in the defeat of the common enemy. Nor could they block the spread of the ideas of national liberation and social emancipation for which the Soviet Union was fighting.

Britain, France and the USA delayed the granting of self-determination they had promised to the peoples in the Atlantic Charter and at the Brazzaville Conference. In the first postwar months and even years they ruthlessly suppressed the national liberation forces in India, Vietnam, Indonesia, Ghana, Algeria and other countries.

Thus, the imperialists exposed themselves and their aims in World War II, the aims which clearly ran counter to those of the peoples who had joined the anti-Hitler coalition. This contradiction could not but set off an open conflict between the national liberation forces and the imperialists and colonialists in the postwar period.

## Chapter Two. Choosing a Political Course During Cold War Years

Viewed against the background of World War II, the ideas of peace and the independence and solidarity of Afro-Asian peoples appeared to be interrelated in the broad national liberation movement. In practical terms, this interrelationship gave rise to the ideas of non-alignment in the policies of the nations that were freeing themselves first in Asia and Africa and then in other parts of the world.

It must be pointed out right off that non-alignment is not something one-sided and fossilized—it is changing notably as it develops. Analyzing non-alignment problems, one is to know its three basic aspects—the foreign-policy *conception*, the *policy* pursued by one or another country, and the *international movement* which implies either the *political trend* in the history of international relations or the *international association* of non-aligned countries as a *component of the system* of these relations. All these are interrelated phenomena, of course, and one should not be surprised to see them often mixed up when it concerns non-alignment in general. In a broader context, the non-aligned movement as a historical process can include all these aspects viewed in their evolution, because, once they have emerged, they exist in it simultaneously. But it would be a mistake not to see that they differ in substance and have emerged at different times.

To avoid confusion or inertia in interpreting the general concept of non-alignment and its versions, one is to have a clear idea of how old the movement is, when and where it emerged, and what role in its development was played by the conferences in Bandung (1955), Belgrade (1961) and Lusaka (1970). Only by considering the diversity of non-alignment as a conception, a policy and an international movement, can the periods of its history be properly outlined.

If one examines the movement as a historical process and an ideological and political trend in modern international relations, one would easily trace its path from the past through the present and into the future. And then it

will appear that the NAM originated in the first years after the war, in India, and it all started with the foreign-policy conception formulated by Jawaharlal Nehru, the leader of the national liberation struggle of the peoples of India, in 1946-1947.

If we assume this approach—which is perhaps the most justified and reasonable—then the history of the movement is clearly divided into three periods:

1. the late 1940s and the 1950s, the period when the movement originated, the non-alignment concept was formulated and began to spread, the policy of non-alignment gained ground in the newly-free countries of Asia and Africa, and their unity was being built;

2. the 1960s, the intermediate period during which cooperation was established among the non-aligned countries which jointly formulated the main goals, principles and direction of the movement, and the first international summit conferences of non-aligned countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe were held;

3. the 1970s and 1980s, the period during which the non-aligned movement has grown as an international association of non-aligned countries and a permanent institution in the system of international relations.

This division offers an opportunity to assess all outstanding events in the history of the NAM, ruling out an underestimation of some of them and overestimation of others. It allows one to examine all such events not in isolation from world history but as an integral part of it, in close interrelationship with the general international situation in each of the three periods.

Since the initial postwar years the struggle launched by the oppressed peoples for self-determination was associated with making a choice between following in the wake of the metropolitan countries and imperialism as a whole and taking a different political course in the world arena. The choice could not be easy, since after a long period of colonial rule the countries of Asia and Africa found themselves bound up with the colonial powers by innumerable ties, depended on them economically and, as Nehru put it, "saw the world ... through ... the British window", or it could be the "window" of any other

metropolitan country. But the choice had to be made and had largely been predetermined by the hostile policy pursued by the imperialists themselves.

Peace remained a burning issue for all nations even after World War II. When Winston Churchill made his notorious "iron-curtain" speech at Fulton in March 1946 and the cold war was launched by the United States and Britain against the Soviet Union, their former ally in the anti-Hitler coalition, the Afro-Asian nations, which had just emerged from World War II, were again faced with a prospect of being used as "cannon fodder" by the colonialists and neocolonialists. The danger was quite real, since Washington openly exploited US monopoly on atomic weapons for establishing "Pax americana".

Meanwhile the imperialist states with the USA at the head continued to pursue their anti-Soviet policy of blocs. They planned to encircle the USSR by blocs hostile to it, which would include also the countries of the Middle and Far East, thus making them involved in the anti-Soviet policy of imperialism. Such blocs would erect yet another barrier in the way of the national liberation movement, the bloc members would be opposed to the countries outside the blocs, and so anti-colonialist unity would be sapped.

Thus the choice of a political path by the nascent states depended on whether they would succumb to the imperialist drive to involve them in the cold war against the USSR holding back the national liberation movement, or they would come up resolutely against imperialism and its policy. The experience of international relations prompted yet another option—permanent neutrality. But the latter did not suit the objective need for active resistance to the colonialists and neocolonialists in the struggle for independence and sovereignty. So a different path was sought. The search was of practical importance to many Afro-Asian countries, which were to decide whether they would join the alliances being imposed on them by the West or not.

Great Britain, for instance, planned to set up an anti-Soviet Middle Eastern military bloc on the basis of the League of Arab States already in 1945 and another mil-

itary alliance in Asia and the Southwestern Pacific in 1946, but all its plans were foiled. In December 1945, the general secretary of the League of Arab States responded to these plans by a statement that the League had no disagreement or misunderstanding with the Soviet Union and therefore it had no reason to join any anti-Soviet blocs. However, Britain did impose bilateral fettering "joint defence" agreements on some countries (Egypt and Jordan) in 1946. This danger confronted other countries which were still in colonial dependence on Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the United States and Portugal, especially those of them where the imperialists left troops and military bases all ready to suppress anti-colonial action.

### **1. Nehru's Philosophy of Non-Alignment**

In that situation Nehru's address to the nation on September 7, 1946, a year before India was declared independent, was nothing short of revolutionary. India would pursue its own policy as a free country and not as a satellite of another country, he declared. He outlined possible directions for an independent policy, which obviously ran counter to the course of the metropolitan country. The chief direction was to keep away, as far as possible, from the power politics pursued by the groups of countries aligned against one another. A few months later, in January 1947, Nehru specified that idea, saying in a speech that India wanted to remain independent and free of blocs and to cooperate with all countries on equal terms.<sup>2</sup>

Later, Jawaharlal Nehru repeatedly returned to the idea of non-alignment and developed it. When he became the prime minister of independent India in August 1947, Nehru gradually made this idea a foreign-policy conception. Though Nehru did not write a work in which this conception would be completely set forth, it can easily be inferred from his numerous utterances. There is every reason to consider Nehru the father of the political philosophy of non-alignment. Therefore, it would

be most appropriate to examine his views on non-alignment, all the more so since the "original image" of non-alignment later became an object of debate and various interpretations.

Summing up Nehru's repeated statements on different aspects of non-alignment, one will have the following picture.

Non-alignment, according to Nehru, is primarily independence of a country and its policy, which could mean for former colonies and semi-colonies dissociation from the international policy of the former metropolitan countries and other imperialist powers and non-participation in any military-political blocs, of which the imperialist powers were, and are, members. But at the same time this is non-alignment with the blocs and policies of any great power of either of the "two hostile camps", to use the terminology of the 1940s and the 1950s.<sup>3</sup>

Does this line mean a "third way" in world politics, or sitting on the fence, or "equidistance" from all great powers and their alliances? Nehru's reply was "No". "There is no question of sitting on the fence. It is not a middle-of-the-road policy. It is positive, constructive policy", Nehru declared.<sup>4</sup> This is a free choice of a position in accordance with the interests of one's country and its goals.

And what are the main interests the non-alignment policy should help to meet and what are the goals it should help to attain? This is how Nehru answered this question: "When we say our policy is one of non-alignment, obviously we mean non-alignment with military blocs... This in itself is not a policy; it is only part of a policy."<sup>5</sup> On the whole, in Nehru's opinion, the non-alignment policy should mean non-participation in the cold war, and also the struggle for peace, disarmament and freedom, and for equality and cooperation among all countries.

Nehru said his country's policy "should primarily aim at avoiding war or preventing war". However he did not view this goal in a pacifist way. He admitted that "the prevention of war may include providing for our own defence".<sup>6</sup> If other countries "are aggressive", Nehru said,

"we have to protect ourselves against their aggression".<sup>7</sup>

Nehru always maintained that the chief goals of non-alignment could be attained only through vigorous struggle. Non-alignment, he noted, has nothing to do with neutrality or passivity or anything of the kind. Therefore, in the event of another world war, a non-aligned country cannot stay aloof. "If there is a big war," Nehru said, "there is no particular reason why we should jump into it. Nevertheless, it is a little difficult nowadays in world wars to be neutral... We are not going to join a war if we can help it; and we are going to join the side which is to our interest when the time comes to make the choice."<sup>8</sup> This remark is most helpful if one wants to see the difference between non-alignment and constant neutrality.

Nehru saw clearly the interdependence between global problems and those which confronted the developing countries alone. "If we cannot prevent war," he said, "then for the moment all our other problems are sunk, we cannot deal with them."<sup>9</sup>

Among these Nehru singled out decolonization and the problem of ending the domination of one country over another. "Where there is continued domination, whether it is in Asia or Africa, there will be no peace either there or in the people's minds elsewhere," he warned. Nehru knew that large-scale conflicts could erupt if colonial rule was not abolished. "We do not want war anywhere," he would stress at the same time.<sup>10</sup>

Nehru always placed the interests of peace above national interests, because "if war comes everyone suffers, so that in the long-distance view, self-interest may itself demand a policy of co-operation with other nations, goodwill for other nations". He interpreted India's interests in a broad context and stressed that "narrow nationalism" can only jeopardize the country's welfare. "Therefore," he said, "we propose to look after India's interests in the context of world co-operation and world peace."<sup>11</sup> That proposition was based on Nehru's firm philosophical conviction that "the world, in spite of its rivalries and hatreds and inner conflicts, moves inevitably towards closer co-operation and the building up of a world commonwealth".<sup>12</sup>



This view of world developments inevitably influenced his non-alignment concept.

But his approach to non-alignment was not all-forgiving. "Of course we stand for anti-colonialism, anti-imperialism, anti-racialism, and all that," Nehru said.<sup>13</sup> Nor did it mean one and the same attitude to relations with the countries allied with blocs. Nehru admitted a possibility that non-aligned countries could have allies and adversaries. "We cannot perhaps be friendly always with every country. The alternative is to become very friendly with some and hostile to others... When I say we should not align ourselves with any power blocs, obviously it does not mean that we should not be closer in our relations with some countries than with others ... our relations can become as close as possible in the economic or other domain with such countries with whom we can easily develop them."<sup>14</sup> Later India established friendly relations with the USSR while its relations with the USA grew very tense.

Where does the strength of the non-aligned countries lie? Nehru saw it not only in their unity but also in the popular support for non-alignment. "Strength comes ultimately from being in line with popular thinking," he observed. "The fact that we are non-aligned has received strength from the fact that millions of people are not aligned, they do not want war, that is why we get indirect strength from this." Weighing the chances of the non-aligned movement, Nehru arrived at this conclusion: "We must not imagine that we can order about great countries or as small countries do as we like. Our capacity is limited, but we have a certain capacity, a certain strength, call it what you like, moral strength, or other strength."<sup>15</sup>

Nehru saw non-alignment not as isolation from the rest of the world but merely as an opportunity to keep balance and not to "lose temper" because of problems arising when relations between blocs grow tense. "It is anyhow an attempt to stand on our feet, not to hop about or dance about or fall down," he said.<sup>16</sup>

At the same time, he was opposed to any outside interference in the internal affairs of the non-aligned countries. He considered it most inadmissible that Western

Europe or America should impose their way of life on other countries. "Europe and America, because they have been dominant continents, with a dominant culture, have tended to think that ways of living other than theirs are necessarily inferior," Nehru said. "But this method of approach of one country to another is very limited and does not indicate much wisdom... The world is a very diverse place, and I personally see no reason why we should regiment it along one line."<sup>17</sup>

Such is the gist of Nehru's non-alignment concept. And it is owing to him that his concept did not remain on paper but was being carried into life by the Indian government.

India was the first to make non-alignment a foreign-policy principle, and the first to become a non-aligned country. From the outset it began to apply this principle on a wide scale in international relations, most prominently in the United Nations. Nehru had every reason to state as early as December 1947: "We have proclaimed during this past year that we will not attach ourselves to any particular group... We have sought to avoid foreign entanglements by not joining one bloc or the other... we were trying to act according to our own lights and according to the merits of the dispute as they seemed to us."<sup>18</sup>

During the cold war in the late 1940s India's non-alignment was a positive factor playing a major role in the balance of world forces. It foiled the plans of the imperialist powers which expected India, after it acquired independence, to follow in the wake of their anti-Soviet policy. Nehru put this plainly enough when he said India stood "for the freedom of Asian countries and for the elimination of imperialistic control over them."<sup>19</sup>

It is most important in this context that India's political activities rectified the wrong impression that in his non-alignment concept Nehru equalized the bloc of imperialist powers and the socialist community. While he deliberately spoke of non-alignment with blocs in general, and with the policies of great powers, Nehru's obvious goal was to soften somewhat the neocolonialists' resistance to India's shaping an independent political course.

But in actual fact this non-bloc course could be, and was, directed solely against the forces of imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, the only enemies of free and peace-loving India, against their plans to set up military blocs in Asia and to involve India and other newly-free countries in them. But it could not, and did not, have contradictions with the Soviet Union and with its policy, which presented no danger to India's development from the outset.

It was symptomatic in this context that already a month after a provisional government was formed in India in 1946, Nehru addressed the Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs with a message saying that the Indian government was prepared to develop friendly relations with the USSR and to exchange diplomatic and other representatives with it, and expressed the hope that co-operation between India and the Soviet Union would benefit both countries and serve the cause of world progress and peace. The history of Soviet-Indian relations shows that his hopes were fully realized.

All this goes to show that, as Jawaharlal Nehru can be called the father of non-alignment, India can well be called the homeland of this political trend which proved to be a new direction in the history of international relations. This has been borne out by the subsequent development of the NAM.

## **2. The First Solidarity Conferences**

The trailblazer of non-alignment, Nehru believed from the start that the policy and concept of non-alignment should be accepted also by other newly-free countries which had a common historical fate with India, common social and economic conditions and common political goals. Sensing unmistakably the spirit of the times, he was confident in the success of his undertaking.

So it happened. The example of India greatly influenced the choice of an international course by former colonies and semi-colonial territories which had acquired independence after India. The leaders of newly-free countries were declaring ideas of non-alignment, or

“positive neutrality”, first in Asia and then also in Africa. Their positions, initially and somewhat later, were in fact a repetition of Nehru’s concept, its versions, which was a sign that the best interests of the nascent states did coincide. Gradually, there emerged real conditions for the growth of Asian, and then Afro-Asian, solidarity, something Nehru dreamed about way back in the late 1920s, when he attended the Brussels congress of oppressed nations.

As he pursued a policy of non-alignment and international cooperation, Nehru attached special significance to restoring ties with the Asian countries that had been severed at the time of colonial rule. In the very first post-war months, Nehru proposed the idea of convening an international conference of Asian countries to discuss common problems of the present and future. The idea found a favourable response, for it was believed in many Asian countries that an all-Asian conference had to be called.

The political leaders and scholars of nearly all Asian countries, from Turkey to the Philippines, including China, Iran, Korea, Mongolia, Tibet, Afghanistan, Burma, Indonesia, Indochina, Ceylon, Malaya, Egypt and other Arab countries, gathered at their conference in Delhi in March 1947. Among the countries which were represented at the conference were the Transcaucasian and Central Asian republics of the Soviet Union. They had been invited to Delhi and attended the first conference of Asian solidarity despite the opposition of Western diplomacy. In his opening speech Nehru welcomed them and said others could learn from them a good deal.

Nothing like this had ever happened in Asia. The 1947 Delhi Conference was the first Asian meeting which signalled the real awakening of Asia and its emergence in the world arena.

Formally the conference was devoted to Asian political, economic and cultural cooperation and was called Asian Relations Conference. But already in his programme speech “Asia Finds Herself Again” Nehru raised broader and still more significant problems: “...The West has... driven us into wars and conflicts without num-

ber and even now, the day after a terrible war, there is talk of further wars in the atomic age that is upon us. In this atomic age Asia will have to function effectively in the maintenance of peace. Indeed, there can be no peace unless Asia plays her part."<sup>20</sup>

Naturally, at the Delhi Conference Nehru advocated his non-alignment philosophy. "Far too long have we of Asia been petitioners in Western courts and chancelleries. That story must now belong to the past," he urged. "We propose to stand on our own legs and to co-operate with all others who are prepared to co-operate with us. We do not intend to be the playthings of others... The countries of Asia can no longer be used as pawns by others; they are bound to have their own policies in world affairs."<sup>21</sup>

Many delegates at the conference backed these ideas of Nehru's, which enhanced the international significance of the conference. Almost thirty years later, the non-aligned countries highly assessed that fact at their 1976 summit conference in Colombo: "Asian commitment to non-alignment first found expression in the Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi in 1947."<sup>22</sup> It was largely due to the Delhi Conference that some more Asian countries followed India in its non-alignment drive in the late 1940s and the early 1950s.

As soon as they emerged in the world arena, the non-aligned countries launched anti-colonial and anti-imperialist actions. This was the case in January 1949, for instance, when India, responding to Burma's proposal, called an intergovernmental conference of 15 states in Delhi on account of the Netherlands' aggression against the Republic of Indonesia. That conference was estimated by Solomon Bandaranaike, the head of the Ceylonese delegation, as historic, for it opposed the imperialist practice of violence with a joint effort of assistance offered by states cooperating on an equal basis.

It must be stressed that the ideas of solidarity among the young states, prompted by the experience of anti-colonial liberation movements, remained anti-imperialist in the new conditions, too. The imperialist powers were responsible for this. US armed intervention against Korea

in 1950 and the colonial war waged by France against the people of Vietnam since 1946 were regarded in India, Burma and Indonesia as a threat to the freedom and independence of all nations, and so they set out to back up the liberation struggle of Korea and Indochina.

However, until the mid-1950s there was no intention to set up an association of non-aligned countries. On the contrary, India and the countries that backed its policy did all to prevent a division of nascent states into those allied in blocs and those outside them.

The young states' course towards full independence in world politics, naturally, did not suit the former colonial powers and other imperialist countries. The very refusal of the nascent states to join any military-political alliances of the West was regarded, for instance, in the USA, as a breach in the collective security system of the United States, and non-alignment was therefore viewed as a much unwanted policy of rapprochement with the Soviet Union. The imperialists offered fierce opposition to the further spread of non-alignment in a bid to keep their former colonies and semi-colonies bound to their foreign policy. The victorious revolution in China followed by the emergence of the People's Republic of China made the imperialists hurry with implementing their "policy of blocs" in Asia.

As they set up the aggressive NATO bloc spearheaded against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the imperialist powers, with the United States at the head, set to surrounding the socialist world with their peripheral military blocs and bases. In 1950, the USA called a conference in Baguio, the Philippines, to set up a bloc in the manner of NATO in South and Southeast Asia. That attempt failed, however, when India not only refused to help set up the bloc but also came out firmly against those who insisted on the very idea and proceeded with its "non-bloc" course of peaceful coexistence with all states, whatever their social system.

Among the Arab countries of Asia and Africa special attention was accorded in the West to Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Jordan, to which in October 1951 the USA, Britain, France and Turkey

made an insistent offer to join Israel in setting up a Middle East allied command for joint defence (which would be linked with NATO) with the headquarters in Cairo. But the Arab countries, too, rejected the Western plan. Pacts in this region are the gates through which Arabs are lured into traps of zones of influence, Gamal Abdel Nasser once observed. But since Arabs want to stay independent, he went on, they did not even think of joining any bloc.

The Afro-Asian movement against the policy of blocs pursued by the imperialist powers was led by India in Asia and Egypt in the Middle East. In the later period they refuted on many occasions the attempts by Western powers to draw them into military groupings. They rightly saw the attempts to impose alien military-political alliances on them as attempts to stem the growth of the national liberation struggle, sap the unity and solidarity of the young states, and thwart their policy of independence and non-alignment in world politics.

But far from all states in Asia could hold out against the pressure applied by the USA and other NATO countries. Turkey joined NATO in 1952 and then, in February 1955, was prodded by Britain and the USA into signing a treaty on military alliance with Iraq. On its basis the Baghdad Pact soon emerged in the Middle East. It was headed by Britain and was joined by Iran and Pakistan. The military-political alliance ANZAM comprising Australia, New Zealand, Britain and Malaya was in existence since 1949, and the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), including the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan, was formed in September 1954.

The members of these alliances illegally assumed the right, under the guise of combating communism, to interfere in the domestic affairs of Asian countries, even those which had not joined any bloc. Thus, Indochina, India, Burma and Indonesia were included in the sphere of SEATO activities without their consent. What this led to was seen in the countries of Indochina and Korea where in 1953 Asian and African troops fought as part of the interventionist forces of the imperialist pow-

ers against those countries. In Korea, for instance, army units of Turkey, Thailand, the Philippines and Ethiopia fought on the side of the US aggressors who used the United Nations flag as a cover.

India, however, refused to send its troops to fight against the Korean people. Nehru explained the refusal by strong unwillingness to back the imperial policy of the United States. The bombs dropped on Korea could as well be dropped on Delhi, Bombay or Calcutta, he said, since the USA would go all lengths to retain its dominating military position in Asia.

So, Asia found itself divided into "bloc" and "non-bloc" countries, which made the relations among them, already worsened by territorial disputes, still more tense. Their peaceful coexistence was jeopardized, and so was their anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist unity. The neo-colonialist policy of blocs had to be countered immediately by a determined action to remedy the situation.

### *Chapter Three. Bandung 1955*

The Conference of Asian and African nations, held in Bandung, Indonesia, in April 1955, was such an action.

By that time the hostilities in Korea had ceased, and France's colonial war in Indochina had ended. But Britain still continued a colonial war in Malaya; the people of Algeria waged a long struggle for liberation from the French colonialists; and the peoples of dozens of countries in Asia and Africa carried on the political struggle to wipe off colonial racist regimes. The cold war was raging in the world, affecting the interests of the newly-free Afro-Asian countries.

In those conditions, the top priority task was to formulate the principles on which the relations among the countries of Asia and Africa would be based and to set the goals of their possible cooperation in the world arena; and all countries, each in its own way, wanted that task to be accomplished.

It was not the task of inventing some entirely new, unheard-of principles of international relations. The par-



ticipants in the Bandung Conference had only to choose from the rich international experience what ever could best facilitate the development of Afro-Asian countries in the complex world situation at that time. The principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems, advanced by Lenin right after the October Revolution in Russia, and the principles of international relations formulated in the United Nations Charter proved most acceptable for the newly-free states.

Just before the Bandung Conference, precisely these principles were chosen to regulate the relations between the two largest newly-free countries in Asia—India and China—which had taken different roads of social development. In a joint statement on the principles of relations between India and China issued in 1954 they said their relations should be based on peaceful coexistence, mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression and non-interference in the domestic affairs of each other, equality, and mutual benefit. By analogy with the five basic Buddhist principles, Nehru proposed that these principles, too, be called “Panch-sheel”. Under this name they very soon became known to the world public and received support in many other Asian countries.

And finally, early in April 1955, that is, on the eve of the Bandung Conference, a conference of the progressive public from 14 Asian countries was held in Delhi. In its resolutions it expressed the firm determination of the Asian nations to build up their unity in the struggle against the aggressive policy of imperialism, against colonialism and racism.

Thus, political conditions were provided for the decisions to be made in Bandung.

The idea of convening a summit conference of Asian and African countries was first proposed by the then President of Indonesia Sukarno back in 1953.

The conference was held on April 18-24, 1955, in the Indonesian city of Bandung and was attended by 23 Asian and 6 African countries, namely: Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, the People's Republic of China, Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gold Coast, India, Indonesia, Iran,

Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, South Vietnam, and Yemen. The list of the participants alone explains a good deal.

Among them were socialist China, capitalist Japan, and feudal Ethiopia; North Vietnam and South Vietnam, the non-aligned countries pursuing an independent policy; the countries bound up with imperialist power by bilateral military-political commitments; and the countries whose foreign policy was determined by their membership in NATO, ANZAM and SEATO.

The Bandung Conference was the first and the largest ever international conference of Asian and African countries, at which half of the world population was represented. This accounted for the great interest it evoked in the world.

By contrast with the Western powers, the socialist countries welcomed the Bandung Conference with enthusiasm. On the eve of its opening, the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a statement expressing confidence that the conference would help strengthen the national awareness of the peoples of Asia and Africa and be a new step on the path of promoting cooperation among the peoples in order to ease world tensions and safeguard world peace. The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Supreme Soviet Presidiums of the Union Republics of the Soviet East sent telegrams of greetings.

According to the decision adopted at the Bogor meeting of the sponsor countries, the Bandung Conference was to discuss international problems of special interest to the peoples of Asia and Africa and promote economic, political and cultural cooperation among Afro-Asian countries. The main debate was over issues of world peace, Afro-Asian security, peaceful cooperation and good neighbourly relations among them, and complete liberation of Asia and Africa from colonial racist regimes.

The participants in the conference were all too diverse, which largely determined its outcome. Despite the common desire for Afro-Asian solidarity, it turned out to be hard to attain that goal, for various delegations saw

these goals differently, and on some issues their views were opposite. Nonetheless, mindful of the tragedy of World War II, they all (including the delegation of Japan which had been the first victim of atom bombing) displayed enough concern for peace and peaceful coexistence, so that the conference would on the whole be successful.

After the long and far from easy debate on this major issue, the conference adopted a declaration on the "Promotion of World Peace and Co-operation". The participants in the Bandung Conference unanimously declared in its main document that the maintenance of world peace and security would facilitate friendly cooperation among states, in keeping with the well-known ten principles which united, on the basis of the UN Charter, the Panchsheel, the principles on which the member countries of blocs had insisted, and the principles vindicated by the non-aligned nations. In fact, the principles of peaceful coexistence were registered there, though not named. Their common idea was to make Asia and Africa continents of peace and cooperation. Should the conference formulate these principles alone and adopt no other resolutions, it would be a historic event all the same.

Though it revealed not only common but also differing views, its agreed documents were, on the whole, positive. "Bandung proclaimed to the world the capacity of the new nations of Asia and Africa for practical idealism, for we conducted our business in a short time and reached agreements of practical value, not quite usual with international conferences," Nehru concluded.<sup>23</sup> One would hardly argue with this.

The success of the conference was mainly due to the delegations of the non-aligned countries, which had strongly influenced the positions of other delegations and the content of the resolutions adopted there. In Bandung, the ideas of non-alignment were clearly set forth, and some of them became part of the conference documents.

Naturally, the non-aligned countries, which made up only half of all the participants in the conference,<sup>24</sup> could not expect their foreign-policy conception to be readily accepted by the rest of the delegates, not to men-

tion their being fully reflected in the joint conference decisions. Therefore, the traditional estimates of the Bandung Conference as a "precursor of the non-aligned movement" or assertions that precisely that conference laid the groundwork of the movement look somewhat exaggerated. A more weighed assessment of the role of the conference was given by the non-aligned countries themselves.

Later, in June 1961, their meeting in Cairo to prepare the first summit conference in Belgrade stated in a protocol that at the Bandung Conference "for the first time some crystallization of thought on 'non-alignment' had taken place".<sup>25</sup> Fifteen years later, the non-aligned countries repeated this estimate at their conference in Colombo in 1976, noting that in Bandung "the concept of non-alignment itself was given concrete expression".<sup>26</sup> No more, no less. And, finally, Prime Minister of India Rajiv Gandhi, in a speech he made in April 1985 on the occasion of the coming 30th anniversary of the Bandung Conference, concluded the discussion by saying that in Bandung it was not a conference of non-aligned countries but a conference of Asian and African countries. The non-aligned movement emerged somewhat later, he said.

This does not in the least diminish the historic significance of the Bandung Conference. The main thing is that its outcome demonstrated that big differences between countries having different social systems, different levels of social and economic development and political regimes, and different political orientations could well be overcome, even in cold war conditions, if the interests of world peace and security prevailed.

Precisely this possibility is implied in the term "the spirit of Bandung", which after the successful consummation of the Afro-Asian conference has become accepted in the parlance of politicians and historians of international relations. The spirit of Bandung is synonymous with solidarity among the countries of Asia and Africa for a joint solution of pressing political and economic international problems, in the name of world peace, the freedom and independence of the peoples, and the equality and mutually beneficial cooperation of states. The spirit of Bandung is a reflection of the objective histor-

ical tendency towards ending the cold war and establishing the principles of peaceful coexistence in the entire system of international relations.

But how viable has the spirit of Bandung proved to be?

A clue to the correct answer is offered perhaps by the following philosophical conclusion of Jawaharlal Nehru made in his speech in India's House of the People on April 30, 1955: "While the achievements and the significance of the meeting at Bandung have been great and epoch-making, it would be a misreading of history to regard Bandung as though it was an isolated occurrence and not part of a great movement of human history. It is this latter that is the more correct and historical view to take."<sup>27</sup>

Indeed, Bandung, important as it is, is just one element in the endless series of developments which proved most significant for the postwar international relations. All of them are associated with the ideas of peace, peaceful coexistence, social and economic progress, freedom and equality of nations. This is the main channel for the powerful and eternal river of history. The world revolutionary process of our time proceeds along this channel, no matter how hard the imperialists may attempt to obstruct or even to reverse this process.

In the post-Bandung period, Afro-Asian solidarity underwent severe trials. Each country that participated in the conference again faced its own political and economic difficulties and all of them were confronted with the severe opposition of the imperialist powers and the monopolies to the implementation of the decisions agreed upon in Bandung. In those conditions the countries that were in, or close to, the blocs and were already bound up with the West by all sorts of commitments proved incapable of placing the interests of Afro-Asian solidarity above these ties.

Therefore, soon after Bandung the policy of blocs and the policy of non-alignment with blocs became so obviously incompatible that the countries that had taken part in the conference were again divided. Turkey remained in NATO, the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan remained in SEATO; and Iraq, in the Baghdad Pact,

though all these blocs were openly used "in the private interests" of the USA and other imperialist powers. Japan and some other countries followed in the wake of US policy. Moreover, in October 1955, merely six months after the Bandung Conference, Iran and Pakistan joined the Baghdad Pact which was then called the Middle East Defence Organization (MEDO). And Pakistan, which was now simultaneously in SEATO and MEDO, served as a link of sorts between the two blocs hostile to the Soviet Union, to the national liberation movement and to Afro-Asian solidarity.

At the same time, India, Egypt and other countries proceeded along the path of non-alignment and independence in world politics. Moreover, the number of non-aligned countries was steadily growing, and they were joined not only by Afro-Asian countries. Yugoslavia, which earlier showed interest in the concept and policy of non-alignment, after the Bandung Conference was rapidly drawing closer to the non-aligned countries of Asia and Africa. In 1956, Nehru and Nasser met with Josip Broz Tito on the Brioni Island in Yugoslavia, and together they charted the path towards the advancement of the non-aligned movement as a political trend in international activity, which was to be broader than just an Afro-Asian movement. In 1961, the first summit conference of this movement, held in Belgrade, was attended by delegates from the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe.

But the idea of Afro-Asian solidarity did not vanish. The seeds it had sowed in Bandung germinated, and the two new processes in the history of international relations—the movements of non-alignment and Afro-Asian solidarity—were growing simultaneously. One of them, the movement of Afro-Asian solidarity, was being organized on both governmental and non-governmental levels. The Asian-African Legal Consultative Committee with the headquarters in Delhi was set up in 1956 and functions to this day. The Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization (AAPSO), which was set up at the conference of 45 countries in December 1957 in Cairo named "People's Bandung", also exists today.

No wonder, then, that the imperialist powers lashed out at both Afro-Asian solidarity, in whatever form it was displayed, and at its individual adherents who sought to pursue a policy in keeping with the Bandung decisions. The next target of imperialist intervention after Egypt were Lebanon and Jordan. This time the intervention was launched by the USA and Britain.

But imperialism could not go unpunished for its stubborn resistance to the natural historical process of national liberation and to the striving of the young states for greater sovereignty.

In July 1958, the people's revolution in Iraq toppled the pro-Western monarchic regime and changed entirely the course of Iraqi foreign policy. The republic took the path of non-alignment and left the Baghdad Pact. That was a heavy blow at the policy of blocs pursued by the Western powers in Asia. To save whatever there remained of the pact, which ceased to be called "Baghdad", its organizers (the USA had been member of its Military Committee since 1957) immediately moved the headquarters of the bloc to Ankara, Turkey, and renamed it the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO). But the idea of the bloc was already undermined.

With the passage of time the spirit of Bandung ceased to be viewed just as the "spirit of tolerance". A number of historically inevitable social, political, economic and other factors required not a passive tolerance but active struggle for peace, security, independence, development and equality for the newly-free countries. That unavoidably led to a clash with the imperialists, colonialists and neocolonialists.

But individual non-aligned countries could not fight single-handed for their international political and economic interests against such a powerful force as world imperialism. The voice of any one of them in the world would be too weak for that. It was imperative that all non-aligned countries should establish close ties, pool their efforts and coordinate their policy. This had to be done to smash the colonial system, defend themselves from neocolonialism, bolster up the international position of each non-aligned state, guarantee its

equality with other countries in the world and ensure peace and security as essential conditions for its rapid advancement.

The non-aligned countries made the first steps towards solidarity back in the mid-1950s, when the meetings of the leaders of three and more non-aligned countries began to be held, though irregularly. In 1958 and 1960, the African non-aligned countries held their own summit conferences. By 1960 there had been already about 20 non-aligned countries in the world, which set the stage for broader conferences. And at the session of the UN General Assembly in New York in September 1960 the leaders of India, Egypt, Yugoslavia, Indonesia and Ghana—Jawaharlal Nehru, Gamal Abdel Nasser, Josip Broz Tito, Ahmed Sukarno and Kwame Nkrumah—agreed to call a conference of all non-aligned countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe.

That marked the end of the first period in the history of the NAM. It may be called a prelude to the movement, if we consider, as it is often done, the 1961 Belgrade Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries to be the starting point. If we do, the whole post-Belgrade period is to be subdivided into two phases—the 1960s and the 1970s-1980s—which differ a good deal in their significance for the growth of the movement.

#### *Chapter Four. Belgrade 1961*

Historians and especially journalists have muddled up the question of who precisely suggested the idea of convening the Belgrade Conference and who organized it. This is explained perhaps by the fact that it took a whole year of preparations to carry through the proposal of India, Egypt, Yugoslavia, Indonesia and Ghana, and that various countries were engaged in the preparatory work.

At first the presidents of Egypt, Yugoslavia and Indonesia undertook to organize the conference. They addressed the heads of state and government of 28 countries in April 1961, asking them to attend the conference, and



in May that year they officially invited them to send their special envoys to Cairo to prepare the conference. The May invitation, however, mentioned that Prime Minister Nehru had also subscribed to it. Later, at the meeting in Cairo, a similar statement was made by a delegation of Afghanistan. Thus, the organizers of that meeting, and of the Belgrade Conference which followed it, were Egypt, Yugoslavia, India, Indonesia and Afghanistan.<sup>28</sup>

The Cairo meeting of 20 non-aligned countries of Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America, held on June 5-12, decided unanimously to hold an international conference of the heads of state or government of non-aligned countries in September that year, before the start of the 16th Session of the UN General Assembly, in order to coordinate their positions at the session. Egypt, Yugoslavia and Cuba proposed that the host country be chosen among them. After some discussion Yugoslavia was chosen.

The delegations at the meeting drew up the agenda for the forthcoming conference and for the first time formulated the criteria to be used in sending invitations to the conference. The decision on the criteria, which proved very important for the subsequent development of the non-aligned movement and its policy, was backed up by the clear-cut directive that no invitation be sent to countries which were non-aligned in name only.

But which countries should be considered non-aligned? In what do the non-aligned countries differ from those aligned with blocs? The Cairo meeting provided this answer:

"1. The country should have adopted an independent policy based on the co-existence of States with different political and social systems and on non-alignment or should be showing a trend in favour of such a policy.

"2. The country concerned should be consistently supporting the Movements for National Independence.

"3. The country should not be a member of a multilateral military alliance concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts.

"4. If a country has a bilateral military agreement with a Great Power, or is a member of a regional defence pact,

the agreement or pact should not be one deliberately concluded in the context of Great Power conflicts.

"5. If it has conceded military bases to a Foreign Power, the concession should not have been made in the context of Great Power conflicts."<sup>29</sup>

Later these criteria were called also the criteria of non-alignment. Sometimes they are regarded as principles of the policy and movement of non-alignment, which is not quite accurate. At any rate, the Cairo decision on non-alignment criteria was of great significance for the policy and movement of non-alignment in the subsequent period. All the non-aligned meetings that followed respected these criteria. The Havana Summit Conference in 1979, in particular, repeated them word for word.

Of course, those were compromise criteria and they were worded rather vaguely, specifically in the provision mentioning "the context of Great Power conflicts". Still, they were sufficient for inviting to the conference just 25 countries of Asia, Africa, Europe and Latin America out of a multitude of countries.

It is significant that when these criteria were applied, only 15 out of 29 countries that had participated in the Bandung Conference were invited to the first conference of the non-aligned movement, namely: Afghanistan, Burma, India, Indonesia, Cambodia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Iraq, Lebanon, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria and Ceylon.<sup>30</sup> The Belgrade Conference was attended also by delegates of Algeria, Guinea, Cyprus, Congo, Cuba, Mali, Morocco, Somalia, Tunisia and Yugoslavia. Algeria was represented by the provisional government, as an armed struggle for independence was under way there. Besides, the delegates of three Latin American countries—Bolivia, Brazil and Ecuador—were present as observers.

The Belgrade Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries was held on September 1-6, 1961. It was warmly welcomed by the socialist countries. In a message to the conference the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers wished the delegates success in their work to promote the great cause of safeguarding world peace. The government and the peoples

of the Soviet Union, the message said, approved of every move to restrain the warmongers. By contrast, the Western countries treated the conference with great caution, and for good reason, as the work of the conference and its outcome showed.

Though the delegates represented diverse trends, their adherence to non-alignment proved to be a uniting factor more effective than Afro-Asian solidarity in Bandung. The Belgrade resolutions were also marked by compromise, but their main thrust was formulated in clearer terms—they contained openly anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist demands rather than mere calls for peaceful coexistence and cooperation.

The conference discussed the international situation and adopted a declaration stating a grave danger of a world conflict, though it categorically rejected the assertion that war was inevitable. It arrived at the significant conclusion that "the principles of peaceful co-existence are the only alternative to the 'cold war' and to a possible general nuclear catastrophe", and that "to eradicate basically the source of conflict is to eradicate colonialism in all its manifestations and to accept and practice a policy of peaceful co-existence in the world". It declared unambiguously that lasting peace could be achieved only in "a world where the domination of colonialism-imperialism and neo-colonialism in all their manifestations is radically eliminated"<sup>81</sup> These ideas were specified in a number of demands stated in the conference resolution.

Thus, the first joint document of non-aligned countries declared that the policy and movement of non-alignment were spearheaded against imperialism and colonialism. Later there was talk of "equidistance" of the movement in the initial period, but the documents prove these assertions wrong.

Indeed, the demand that an immediate stop be put to armed action and repressive measures of any kind against dependent peoples could be addressed only to colonial powers and other imperialist powers. All the more so, since the documents called for support to the struggle of the Algerians and Angolans for freedom and indepen-

dence, expressed the demand of the Tunisian people that the French troops should leave their country, 'and denounced foreign intervention of the Congo, the policy pursued by imperialism with regard to the Middle East, and apartheid in South Africa. It is significant to note that the conference called on all peace-loving countries, particularly the member states of the United Nations, to help the people of Angola establish their free and independent state without delay. That call was heeded, of course, not by the imperialist powers but by those to whom it was addressed, above all by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

One can hardly fail to see the clearly anti-American thrust in that part of the Declaration of the Belgrade Conference which said that the right of Cuba, as that of any other nation, freely to choose its political and social system in accordance with its own conditions, needs and possibilities should be respected; or that "the participating countries consider the establishment and maintenance of foreign military bases in the territories of other countries, particularly against their expressed will, a gross violation of the sovereignty of such States".<sup>32</sup> It was precisely the imperialist powers, the USA above all, that have always opposed a free choice of a socio-political system by young states and built their military bases on the territories of these states. This truth was set forth in the Declaration's provision that the US military base in Cuba affects the sovereignty and territorial integrity of that country.

Furthermore, the demand of the conference that "efforts should be made to remove economic imbalance inherited from colonialism and imperialism" and the demand, recorded in its Declaration, that "all peoples may, for their own ends, freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources", were certainly addressed to the colonialists and neocolonialists. Because only colonialist and other imperialist powers did all they could to go ahead with their former practices and were intent on plundering the natural wealth of the newly-free countries.

The participating states suggested the idea of trade and economic cooperation among all developing coun-

tries in order to hold out against outside political and economic pressure. They invited all the countries concerned to consider the convocation, as soon as possible, of an international conference to discuss their common problems and to reach an understanding on ways and means of compensating for all damage which may hinder their development and to agree upon the most effective measures to ensure the realization of their economic and social development. That move largely facilitated the drive for restructuring international economic relations. Responding to that call, the developing countries convened their international economic conference in Cairo already in 1962, and later set up the Group of 77.

The fact that the countries participating in the Belgrade Conference differed from one another in social and political terms undoubtedly affected the work of the conference and its outcome. The participants, in particular, failed to reach full agreement on the major question—which of the anti-imperialist tasks should be given top priority. The difference was most conspicuous in the positions of Asian and African countries on the proportion between the struggle for peace and the struggle for the elimination of racist colonialist regimes. Doudou Thiam, former minister of foreign affairs of Senegal, recalled that at the 1961 Belgrade Conference when Jawaharlal Nehru “believed the problem of universal peace to be more important than all other problems, the overwhelming majority of African states considered that the colonial issue was the one of top priority”.<sup>33</sup>

There were differences over other issues as well, and compromise decisions were to be taken after a debate. But, on the whole, the struggle for peace, freedom and equitable cooperation among countries was the keynote of the Belgrade Conference, while close interests and adherence of all its participants to the course of non-alignment proved to be a fairly strong uniting factor.

Defining the role of the non-aligned countries in the world arena in the cold war conditions, the participants stated that the activities of these countries in the interests of peace were among the more important factors of safeguarding world peace. The Declaration expressed the firm

conviction that "the further extension of the non-committed area of the world constitutes the only possible and indispensable alternative to the policy of total division of the world into blocs, and intensification of cold war policies" and stated just as firmly that "the non-aligned countries ... do not wish to form a new bloc and cannot be a bloc".<sup>34</sup>

Aware of the moral and political strength of their unity, the non-aligned countries participating in the Belgrade Conference did not overestimate this strength. This was best expressed in the speech by Jawaharlal Nehru. "I know," he declared, "that the key to the situation does not lie in the hands of this Conference or in those of other congresses or conferences... We must not overestimate our own importance. After all, we do not control the strings of the world, not only in the military sense but in other senses also. If our mandate ran it would be easy enough—we would issue the mandate... We must realize both our actual and our potential strength that we have, and also the lack of strength that we have."<sup>35</sup> These carefully considered words came as a warning against the temptation to overrate the international significance of the non-aligned movement as regards the balance of forces today.

Nehru, Nasser and other leaders of non-aligned countries stated in the Belgrade Declaration that "peace and stability in the world depend, to a considerable extent, on the mutual relations of the Great Powers".<sup>36</sup> Therefore they deemed it necessary to approach the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "as representatives of the two most powerful nations of our day, in whose hands lies the key to peace and war",<sup>37</sup> with messages, asking them to resume talks in order to relieve the world of the war menace.

The resolution on sending the messages said: "While decisions leading to war or peace at present rest with these Great Powers, the consequences affect the entire world."<sup>38</sup> Therefore, the conference urged the Great Powers to sign without delay a treaty on general and complete disarmament, to conclude an agreement on ban-

ning all nuclear tests and use outer space only for peaceful purposes. In the Declaration the conference recommended the UN General Assembly to convene either a special session on disarmament or a world disarmament conference under the auspices of the United Nations, with non-aligned countries necessarily taking part in such a conference.

The Soviet Government gave a written reply to the message of the non-aligned countries in ten days, stating that its views largely coincided with the considerations and decisions of the Belgrade Conference delegates. It stressed that "the Soviet Union would not like to follow the line of military rivalry with the Western powers. It is not our policy, it is not our path and we would not like to follow this path if we are not compelled to do this. Our greatest and most cherished wish is to live in friendship with all states, to live in a world without weapons, in a world without wars." Responding to the call of the peace-loving non-aligned states for direct Soviet-American summit talks, the Soviet Government said it was prepared, in the name of peace, to start the talks at any time, in any place and on any level.

The proposals advanced at the conference, which were consonant with the Soviet peace moves and were backed by the entire socialist community, were carried into life, even though partially. Some of them are still urgent today and the struggle for their implementation is going on.

The Belgrade Conference was a major event in the history of international relations of our time. It heralded the emergence of a new independent political group of states capable of influencing the world balance of forces when it comes to the solution of major issues. It placed the non-aligned countries on a new level of collective policy-making, the level of international summit conferences. It opened the path to the further advance of the non-aligned movement not only as a historical process in international relations but also as a community of non-aligned countries, as an institution in the organized structure of international relations.

When assessing the significance of the Belgrade Conference one should remember that the widespread view

that the non-aligned movement was founded at it as an international association of non-aligned countries is not exactly correct. This view, considering the developments since then, is admissible, if one does not count the 15 years preceding the conference, the years when the concept and policy of non-alignment were taking shape. But in 1961, neither the delegates to the conference themselves, nor anyone else put the question that way. At that time the conference was not regarded as a founding one, and it was only later that it was called the first conference.

In their appeals to the non-aligned countries in April and May 1961 those who suggested the idea of holding the conference did not speak of setting up an association of these countries. The term "non-aligned movement" was not as much as mentioned either in these appeals, or in the communique issued at the preparatory meeting in Cairo, or in the Declaration of the Belgrade Conference itself. Assessing a possible significance of the conference in the Declaration, the participants confined themselves to saying that it marked the beginning of the exchange of opinion on international problems.

In a speech at the special meeting to mark the 20th anniversary of the Belgrade Conference during the Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries, held in February 1981 in Delhi, Indira Gandhi had this to say about the significance of the Belgrade Conference: "Even before that Conference, nation after newly free nation had proclaimed its allegiance to and adoption of non-alignment. Close bonds of fellow feeling and common purpose had already been established among them. Belgrade represented a formal demonstration of community of interest."<sup>39</sup>

### ***Chapter Five. From International Conferences to International Unity***

The international relations after the Belgrade Conference showed that its assessment of the situation at the time was correct and the demands it held against the im-



perialist powers were well justified. The expansion of joint efforts by the states which had declared non-alignment the official line of their foreign policy helped to solve a number of international problems in those years. Colonial regimes were abolished in a few more countries, India liberated the Portuguese colonies Goa, Daman and Diu, Algeria won the war against the French colonialists, the Cuban revolution held out in the open clash with US imperialism, troops were withdrawn and military bases removed from a number of nascent states, and the non-aligned countries promoted the peaceful settlement of the border dispute between China and India.

In 1963, an anti-imperialist organization of non-aligned countries, the first one representing a whole continent, was set up—the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In its Charter it recognized non-alignment to be the common principle of the policy pursued by its member states. The non-aligned movement speeded up the unification of developing countries in the Group of 77 (1964), which launched a stubborn drive for restructuring the economic relations with the West on principles of justice and equality.

To continue the exchange of opinion, the next summit conference of non-aligned countries was held in 1964 in Cairo on the initiative of Yugoslavia, Egypt and Ceylon. It was called the “second conference”, which meant that the Belgrade one was admitted to be the first. But that time, too, no mention of a “non-aligned movement” was made. In fact, both conferences were not related with one another, each was held in its own way, no other coordinating meetings of all non-aligned countries had been held in the period between them, and the time and place of the next conferences were not fixed. The Cairo Conference, on the whole, charted the outlines of cooperation among non-aligned countries, but did not specify them.

The absence of a permanent machinery to organize joint actions by non-aligned countries made itself felt pretty soon. After the Cairo Conference, as the new tide of the cold war rolled in and the imperialist powers were building up pressure, the non-alignment process

was stuck notably, and for the next six years the non-aligned countries failed to convene a single summit meeting. Only one meeting of 17 non-aligned countries was held in March 1965 in Belgrade, at which the delegates demanded a political solution of the Vietnam problem. The West built up its all-out pressure to the point at which "the non-aligned countries, especially in Africa and to some extent in Asia", according to Josip Broz Tito, "have become confused and stand apart, concentrating on their domestic problems, believing that in this way they will be able to resist the pressure from the imperialist forces".<sup>40</sup> Such were the sentiments in the governmental quarters at that time.

The public response to the situation in the newly-free countries, whose solidarity by that time exceeded, in geographic terms, the bounds of Asia and Africa, was all too different. This process was promoted by the 1959 revolution in Cuba which from the outset was the target of aggressive scheming by US imperialism and badly needed international support. The act of imperialist aggression in Playa Jiron in April 1961, the open interference of US troops in the domestic affairs of the people of Vietnam and US aggressive actions against North Vietnam in 1964-65 showed beyond doubt that imperialism presented a threat to Asian, African and Latin American peoples alike. The peoples of the three continents were thus becoming aware of their common historical fate, and common interests.

This is why the Afro-Asian Peoples' Solidarity Organization suggested the idea of calling a conference of solidarity among the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The idea was announced for the first time at a session of the AAPSO Council held in Bandung in April 1961. Then, the AAPSO passed a decision, in response to a suggestion by Fidel Castro, that the conference be held in Cuba's capital Havana. It was held there in January 1966 and was attended by delegates from 82 countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America and by observers from the USSR, the socialist countries of Europe and international organizations.

It passed a number of resolutions which were of great

importance for safeguarding peace and peaceful coexistence among countries with different social and political systems and for ensuring the success of the struggle of the peoples for national freedom, and against imperialist aggression. In its General Declaration and resolutions the Conference displayed the strong aspect of the movement of solidarity among the peoples of the three continents— their unity with all peace forces in the world. The conference stressed the need for close cooperation with the socialist countries, with the working class, and the revolutionary and progressive organizations of the peoples of Europe and North America. However, considering the diversity of the delegates, such resolutions could not, of course, be passed without difficulty and difference of opinion.

The decisions of the Havana Conference of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, adopted at the time when Western propaganda trumpeted the end of the Bandung spirit, the decline of Afro-Asian solidarity and the crisis of non-alignment, when the Sino-Indian armed border conflict erupted in 1962 and the "Second Bandung" failed in 1965, made the imperialists see red.

To hamstring the anti-imperialist solidarity of the newly-free countries, Washington organized a separate conference of the countries of Asia and the Pacific in Seoul, South Korea, as early as June 1966. It was attended by the foreign ministers of Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Taiwan, South Vietnam and South Korea. The Conference was expected to be used for setting up an international organization of those countries against "communist infiltration" of any kind. Simultaneously, condemnations of the Havana "tricontinental" by "loyal" governments were organized in Latin America and Africa.

Imperialism launched counter-attacks against the national liberation movement and against the sovereignty of young states. The war of aggression waged by the USA against the Vietnamese people, the involvement of Thailand and the Philippines into that war, the setting up of a new bloc, ASPAC, comprising these countries and

Malaysia, in 1966, the act of aggression by Israel, backed up by the USA, in the Middle East in 1967, the practice of interference in the domestic affairs of young states, political and economic pressure—all this indicated that the counter-offensive was acquiring threatening proportions.

Meanwhile a large number of countries freed themselves from colonial dependence and chose non-alignment as the course in international relations, which largely expanded the geographic zone of non-alignment. That zone became the largest in Africa, though this did not occur overnight.

When granting independence to their African colonies, the colonialists ensnared the young states in numerous bilateral agreements, which, combined with political and economic pressure, slowed down the dissociation of former colonies from the world politics of imperialism. Therefore, the Africa Year in 1960, during which the number of independent states on the continent increased from 10 to 27, failed to be a turning point—less than half of African countries took part in the Belgrade Conference.

The turning point came only after the OAU was set up in May 1963 and proclaimed non-alignment to be a major principle of its Charter. African unity in the OAU framework served as the basis for drawing the overwhelming majority of the newly-free African states in the international non-aligned movement. Many years later, in 1976, the Fifth Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Colombo called that event a development of major significance in the history of non-alignment.

The OAU was the world's first and the only organization of non-aligned countries covering a whole continent, and precisely due to the OAU free Africa was viewed in the world as a "non-aligned continent". So, speaking about the growth of the non-aligned movement as an international association, Africa outstripped all the other regions within the movement. Furthermore, in organizational terms, non-aligned Africa reached a level which had not yet been attained by the non-aligned movement as a whole. The OAU bodies were functioning

regularly from the start, despite the ups and downs in the international situation.

By 1970 the OAU member states had made up the majority among the non-aligned countries of the world. Their example and the uninterrupted functioning of the OAU doubtlessly influenced the shaping of the organizational make-up of the NAM, promoting in it the tendencies towards unity.

The conditions in Europe, Latin America and Asia differed, no doubt, from those in Africa, and the non-aligned countries were too diverse themselves to be able to form anything like the OAU for all of the four continents. But the idea of creating a mechanism ensuring a constant coordination of the policies of all non-aligned countries was already "in the air".

That required thorough preparations, which started with the convocation, on Tito's suggestion, of a consultative meeting of 44 non-aligned countries in Belgrade in July 1969. The participants in that meeting were agreed on the need for a more active approach on the international scene and concerted efforts within the UN framework, and exchanged views on various forms and possibilities for more regular and comprehensive consultations and cooperation. They arrived at the conclusion that time had come for a new summit conference.

A great role in the resumption of the practice of non-aligned summit conferences was played by Yugoslavia, and by Tito personally. Speaking at the Lusaka Conference in September 1970, Indira Gandhi said: "We must also thank President Tito but for his efforts this meeting would not have taken place."<sup>41</sup>

The Lusaka summit conference of 54 non-aligned countries opened the phase during which the non-aligned countries were uniting as an institution in the system of international relations. It was the first ever conference to use the terms "non-aligned movement" and "member states of the non-aligned movement" in its final documents, and passed a very significant decision "to strengthen steadily, and expand the domain of mutual cooperation within the international, regional and bilateral frameworks; to ensure the *continuity of action* (italics

mine.—Y. A.) by holding periodic consultations of representatives of non-aligned countries at different levels”<sup>42</sup>

Already in his opening address at the Lusaka Conference its chairman, President of Zambia Kenneth Kaunda, put it straight that “a call for action is not enough unless there exists an adequate machinery to carry it out... It is for this reason that *we genuinely need the machinery* (italics mine.—Y. A.) for maintaining contact among us to ensure continuity in the development of the non-aligned movement and the implementation of our decisions.”<sup>43</sup> The conference adopted a special resolution “On the Strengthening of the Role of the Non-Aligned Countries”, in which it stressed “*the need for appropriate implementation of machinery* of a flexible charter while at the same time having no financial implications, to provide for continuity, maintain contacts between member States and ensure the implementation of the decisions of the Conference of non-aligned countries”<sup>44</sup> (italics mine.—Y. A.)

As the first step on this path the conference gave its chairman the powers to take all necessary steps to maintain contacts among member states, ensure continuity, and carry into effect the decisions, resolutions and directives of the conference. Besides, in that resolution the conference requested all representatives of the non-aligned countries in the United Nations and its specialized agencies and in all international bodies to coordinate and harmonize their efforts and to take all necessary steps to ensure the appropriate implementation of the resolutions, decisions and directives of the Conference of Non-Aligned Countries.

Thus the non-aligned countries made the second major step towards joint activities as they went over from the level of international conferences they had reached in 1961-64 to a higher level of creating a permanent machinery for conducting these activities. By putting this machinery into operation, the Lusaka Conference begot the association of non-aligned countries, which then became an element of the system of international relations. So, it was 24 years after the concept of non-alignment ori-

ginated and nearly a decade after the countries which had chosen non-alignment as their common political line in world affairs held their first conference, that these countries founded the non-aligned movement as we know it today.

The new line of imparting organizational stability to the solidarity of the non-aligned countries, which was adopted in Lusaka, was continued at the subsequent summit forums in Alger (1973), Colombo (1976), Havana (1979) and Delhi (1983). Their preparations and the resolutions they adopted produced the decisions whose implementation brought about a multitude of various bodies of the movement and gradually improved its activities.

Simultaneously, the geographic zone of the movement expanded as the number of its member states was growing rapidly: 30 new members joined the NAM in 1970-76 alone. On the whole, its membership more than tripled in 1961-76 and now included all independent states in Africa, most of Asian countries and a number of states in Latin America and Western Europe. At the end of the 1970s, the NAM comprised 93 countries and was among the largest international associations.

This rapid growth of the movement was due primarily to the change from the cold war to detente, which began in the 1970s under the influence of the Soviet policy of peace. Detente and the normalization of relations between the USSR and the USA, the USSR and the FRG, and the GDR and the FRG, and progress in the efforts to promote security and peaceful coexistence in Europe improved the political climate in the world, facilitated the pursuance of non-alignment policy by the young states and helped many of them to solve quite a few problems (such as expansion of cooperation with the Soviet Union, recognition of the GDR, revision of inequitable treaties with the former colonial powers, and the dismantling of imperialist military bases), all of which had come up against strong resistance on the part of the West.

During the period of detente the imperialist policy of blocs suffered a series of heavy setbacks in the devel-

oping world, though after four years of negotiations Britain, Australia and New Zealand did manage to set up the military bloc ANZUK and to draw non-aligned Malaysia and Singapore into it. SEATO began to split apart until it totally disintegrated in 1977. ASPAC ceased to exist and, finally, CENTO, that successor of the Baghdad Pact, fell into pieces in 1979, after the anti-Shah and anti-American revolution in Iran and the withdrawal of Iran and Pakistan from that bloc. Iran and Pakistan joined the non-aligned movement.

The victory of the Vietnamese people, which crowned the 30-year war against the imperialist aggressors, the victories scored by other peoples of Indochina, the rebuff offered by Arab countries to Israeli aggressors in 1973, the elimination of the Portuguese colonial regimes in Asia and Africa, and the expulsion of the South-African invaders from the People's Republic of Angola served as a source of inspiration for the NAM states. The effective use of joint economic pressure on the imperialist powers and monopolies by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) set an inspiring example of a resolute struggle for restructuring the inequitable economic relations with the capitalist world.

The victories won in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism activated the movement. It stood the test of time and grew so strong that the new worsening of the international situation at the turn of the 1980s could no longer paralyze it, as had been the case in the late 1960s. Even the Iran-Iraq war delayed for half a year, but not prevented, the holding of the next non-aligned summit conference in 1983 (it was held in Delhi instead of Baghdad). This fact alone was a sign of greater possibilities, as compared with the late 1960s, for a better functioning of the NAM's machinery. It occupied a secure place in the modern system of international relations as an institution of the system.

It was only natural that such progress of the NAM added substantially to its political weight in the world.



<sup>1</sup> East Germany had to satisfy only the reparation claims of the USSR and Poland.

<sup>2</sup> NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization were set up much later. By "blocs" Nehru meant two camps opposed to each other and the peripheral pacts set up by the West.

<sup>3</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru first used the term "non-alignment" only in 1954. Before that, India and other Asian countries, and later African countries, called their policy "positive neutralism", as distinct from the neutrality of some West European countries.

<sup>4</sup> Jawaharlal Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, Delhi, 1961, pp. 80, 45.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 79.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 46.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>9</sup> *The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, Belgrade, September 1-6, 1961*, Publicisticko-Isd-vacki Zavod, Yugoslavia, 1961, p. 116.

<sup>10</sup> J. Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, p. 48.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., p. 28.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>13</sup> *The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 108.

<sup>14</sup> J. Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, pp. 45, 47.

<sup>15</sup> *The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 116.

<sup>16</sup> J. Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, p. 47.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., p. 49.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., pp. 24, 25.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 24.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 251.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 191.

<sup>23</sup> J. Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, p. 279.

<sup>24</sup> Of the 29 countries that took part in the Bandung Conference, only Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Sudan were invited to, and attended, the First Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held in Belgrade in 1961.

<sup>25</sup> *The Third World Without Superpowers: The Collected Do-*

*cuments of the Non-Aligned Countries*, Vol. I, Oceana Publications Inc., Dobbs Ferry, New York, 1978, p. 36.

<sup>26</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 191.

<sup>27</sup> J. Nehru, *India's Foreign Policy*, p. 280.

<sup>28</sup> *The Third World Without Superpowers: The Collected Documents of Non-Aligned Countries*, Vol. I, pp. 33-34.

<sup>29</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 2.

<sup>30</sup> By that time Egypt and Syria had united and were represented in Belgrade as one state—the United Arab Republic (UAR).

<sup>31</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, pp. 5, 6.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>33</sup> Doudou Thiam, *La politique étrangère des Etats africains*, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1963, p. 114.

<sup>34</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 6.

<sup>35</sup> *The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries*, pp. 109, 113.

<sup>36</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 6.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 532.

<sup>40</sup> Josip Broz Tito, *Selected Articles and Speeches*, Politizdat Publishers, Moscow, 1963, p. 365 (in Russian).

<sup>41</sup> *Review of International Affairs*, Belgrade, Vol. XXI, No. 491, September 20, 1970, p. 21.

<sup>42</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 47.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 57.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.

## II

### **ASSOCIATION OF NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES—A NEW INSTITUTION IN THE HISTORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

The summit conferences of all non-aligned countries in the 1960s, followed by the international unification of these countries, proved to be an entirely new phenomenon in world history, especially if one considers the geographic area of the movement and its political scope.

Since the 1961 Belgrade Conference of Non-Aligned Countries to this day, there has never been other international forums attended by so many top leaders of sovereign states. They are the largest international summit meetings today. Suffice it to recall that at the Havana Conference in 1979, 50 out of 93 member states—and at the 1983 Delhi Conference 58 out of 99—were represented by heads of state and government. The conferences were attended also as observers or guests by UN Secretaries-General (since 1973) and heads of other international organizations, vice-presidents, deputy premiers and foreign ministers of many countries, and by leaders of most of national liberation organizations.

The better organizational make-up which developed in NAM in the 1970s enabled it to enter securely the system of international relations. And though it has no official permanent mission either in the United Nations or elsewhere, its coordinating bodies and the temporary missions it sends to the UN and to various countries are generally recognized today. Groups of non-aligned countries operate on a large scale and have been recognized de facto in the UN and in other worldwide international organizations.

At present, no one in the world can afford to ignore the objective fact that the group of non-aligned countries in the UN plays an influential role in the work of any UN agency. It is often the initiator not only of adopt-

ing resolutions but also of calling special sessions of the UN General Assembly and Security Council meetings. Being in the majority in the UN, the non-aligned countries have become an efficient political force on which it often depends whether some or other resolution is adopted at the UN General Assemblies (the practice known as "majority rule" in the West).

After the number of Security Council members increased from 11 to 15 in 1965, and that of the Economic and Social Council went up from 27 to 54 in 1973, the role of the NAM countries in these chief UN bodies increased considerably. This is most evident in the Security Council, though 5 out of 15 seats there are occupied, according to the UN Charter, by permanent members having the power of veto, while the non-aligned countries may have only 6 to 8 out of the rest of the seats reserved for non-permanent members. The point is that, according to the UN Charter, decisions in the Security Council are considered valid with the majority vote being 9 to 6 on matters of procedure (all the nine should be Council members), and on all other matters the nine should include all the permanent members of the Council. In practical terms, this means that the group of non-aligned countries in the Council should have the backing of 2 or 3 members to ensure the adoption of any draft resolution, unless it is vetoed by a great power. But even without the power of veto this group can, independently or with the support of at least one member of the Council, block the adoption of any resolution by the Council, including those on most important issues, because with seven votes cast against it a resolution is turned down. All this is possible, of course, if the non-aligned member states of the Council are unanimous.

The activity of the non-aligned movement on the world scene gives us every reason to state that, like the African diplomacy of the OAU, and like the collective diplomacy of other regional and subregional international organizations, there exists the collective diplomacy of the NAM states. In diplomatic terms, it almost does not differ from most international organizations, and it becomes increasingly active at that.

As for the international legal status of the NAM, it has some specific features today. Whereas its conferences in the 1960s looked like ordinary international meetings and were nothing new in international legal terms, beginning with the 1970s the NAM began to differ from other multilateral international institutions by its unusual international legal status and the organization of its activity.

But what is new in the non-aligned movement as an international institution?

A classical model of the international organization normally has a number of distinctive features: it has a charter, permanent executive bodies, the headquarters, a budget, a procedure, and so on. Even if an organization has only some of these features, its main quality is still there—stability and long life. Another form of multilateral international intercourse—international conferences—also has its own features, the main one being that they are convened for a relatively brief period of time to discuss a certain issue or solve a definite problem.

Compared with these classical institutions, the non-aligned movement hardly fits into any of these categories. But, considering that the movement has existed for so many years, it cannot be regarded either as a conference or as a temporary organization. On the other hand, it cannot be considered a permanent intergovernmental organization for the simple reason that at the conference in Belgrade in 1961 the non-aligned countries said firmly they did not wish to form a new bloc, for any bloc meant there is a permanent international organization. Besides, the NAM has neither a charter nor other main attributes of an international organization.

The situation is peculiar, indeed: the non-aligned movement on the whole is not an organization, but it consists, as it were, of several international organizations, for almost all the countries in the movement are members of some or other regional or subregional organization, while the Arab League, the OAU, and the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) take part in non-aligned forums as observers.

What is behind this situation? At this stage of the movement it is evidently caused by the great diversity

of its members in social, political and economic terms, which naturally limits their organizational unity and co-operation. Besides, nearly all the member countries cast off the colonial yoke and therefore greatly value independence and full equality in international relations and seek a unification formula sufficient for these ends. From this point of view the non-aligned movement has notable advantages for its member states, as compared with any other international organization. The absence of a supra-state mechanism, of a strict organizational structure and hierarchy, and deliberate vagueness of many procedural rules, in fact, suit the members of the movement. Not bound by "the letter of the charter" and other formal restrictions, they have their hands free in world politics and can take independent decisions in some or other situation.

At present, it can only be stated that the non-aligned movement is an unusual phenomenon in the history and system of international relations. This is a new institution of these relations and of international law, an institution which by its status in the organisational pattern of modern international relations has exceeded the level of international conferences but has not yet reached the level of international organizations and is halfway between the two. It would be more correct to define it as an international association of non-aligned countries.

In this respect the NAM is comparable only with the Group of 77 of the developing countries, the other such unusual association in the world. But the Group of 77 emerged after the non-aligned movement did, which fact, besides, speeded up the formation of the Group. After that the NAM and the Group of 77 influenced and complemented each other in all matters, including organizational ones. However, since the NAM members simultaneously are in the Group and even constitute the overwhelming majority in it (101 out of some 130 countries in 1986), their influence prevails.

It is safe to say that as institutions of modern international relations both the NAM and the Group of 77 demonstrate a new way of organizing international cooperation.

Therefore, among numerous questions arising from the analysis of the NAM as a unique phenomenon in the history and system of international relations the unavoidable question is: How exactly is it developing and what is the internal mechanism of its activity? This is not a technical question as it may seem at first. The history of non-alignment has shown that the great political significance attached to its organizational machinery by the non-aligned countries themselves is well justified.

### ***Chapter One. The Mechanism of the Non-Aligned Movement***

Today, the mechanism of the movement's operation and development is among the least studied aspects of non-alignment, and the few brief studies published so far are marred by reticence and discrepancies. This is accounted for by the fact that the movement is fairly young in historical terms, that it is an unusual element in the system of international relations and is not yet fully developed, and that the principles of its operation are vague, some of them not even registered in any official document. Still, a closer study of the many years of the movement's activity will reduce to the minimum the unexplored ground in this area of research.

As it has already been mentioned here, the NAM as an international association has no charter spelling out its goals, principles and structure and strictly regulating its functions and the operation of its organs.

Its organizational forms do not come from nothing—the experience of the UN, the OAU and other international organizations is duly used. The practice of the NAM's activity and development is very helpful in improving the mechanism of the movement. During the years the NAM has been in existence, its meetings at different levels have passed many resolutions, including those on organizational and procedural matters. Corrected in the course of their practical implementation, these resolutions gradually made up a code of principles which could, if necessary, be formalized in something

like a charter. So far, the non-aligned countries have been refraining from producing such a document, but this does not change anything in fact—their association already has a clear-cut organizational structure and an ever improving procedure of operation.

It must be remembered that permanent bodies and posts like that of the UN Secretary-General are absent in the movement's structure: all the functions within the movement are performed by statesmen of the member countries. Neither does it have an established hierarchy, direct subordination, or a strict delimitation of functions among the main political bodies. Decisions on major political, economic and organizational issues can be made, and are made, for instance, at conferences of the heads of state or government and at Coordinating Bureau sessions. Nonetheless, there is, of course, a difference between the roles and missions of each NAM body.

#### **1. The Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries**

As a historical process, the non-aligned movement originated and began to grow "from below"—its pioneers were individual states. But as part of the system of international institutions it was shaped "from above"—its supreme body began to function long before the other elements of the mechanism did. The point is that the conferences of the heads of state or government were recognized *de facto* to be such a body, though their powers have not been fully defined in an official document.

The great importance and the functions of the summit conferences are seen from such factors as the highest level of the participants, the agenda, and the resolutions passed. This alone automatically enhances the prestige of the government of a host country among its population and in the world at large. But prestige is not the only thing that matters here. As it was noted by Indira Gandhi in a speech after the Delhi Conference, India had offered its capital for the conference not for the sake of prestige but in order to do justice to the strength



the non-aligned movement is giving to the developing countries.

Briefly speaking, the functions of the summit conferences are as follows: every such conference analyzes the main international problems and developments, charts the strategic guidelines for non-alignment policy, elaborates the joint position of the non-aligned countries at the UN, adopts policy-making documents of the movement, and decides major issues related to its activity and development. It has become an established practice to call such conferences once in about three years and their resolutions are adopted for this period, that is, until the next summit conference.

The summit conferences are significant not only in that urgent issues are discussed and final documents are adopted there. Their participants have always widely used these forums for numerous bilateral summit meetings. During the five or six days of a conference, the heads of some delegations have enough time to establish contacts with dozens of other delegations, discuss problems related to cooperation between their countries and decide moot questions.

And, last but not least, the significance of any summit conference is seen also from the fact that, beginning with 1970, the host country is declared to be the coordinating country and its leader is elected Chairman of the conference until the next summit conference is convened. Besides, a Coordinating Bureau is elected for this period, to be presided over by the coordinating country. The foreign minister of that country chairs ministerial meetings held in New York. All this, naturally, adds to the weight of the NAM conferences.

## **2. The Coordinating Country and the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement**

In the documents adopted by the movement these organs are not strictly defined. The host country of a summit conference may be called a coordinating country or Chairman of the Movement, and the country's leader

is called just the Chairman of the Movement. But their powers and functions have not been fully defined.

According to a resolution of the Third Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries held in 1970 in Lusaka—this resolution being of fundamental importance—the Chairman of the Movement ensures continuity in the development of the movement and is authorized to take all necessary steps to maintain contacts among member states, and sees that the movement's decisions are carried into effect. The Fourth Conference held in 1973 in Alger entrusted the Chairman with informing the next session of the UN General Assembly about the work done and the decisions taken. This has been the function of the chairmen of all the subsequent conferences ever since.

Besides, the coordinating country is to ensure an uninterrupted activity of the NAM, prepare its conferences and draw up its draft documents. The Fifth Summit Conference in 1976 adopted a special decision which for the first time named the functions of the Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the movement representing the coordinating country.

The greater duties of the coordinating country do not give it more rights or advantages in the world arena. Practice has shown that chairmanship does not automatically guarantee the coordinating country backing by all the non-aligned countries, say, in the UN.

The coordinating country or the Chairman are given no supra-state powers within the movement. The Chairman has a very limited role, said Indira Gandhi, who was elected Chairman at the Delhi Conference of Non-Alignment. The Chairman should work to ensure consensus but a decision actually depends on all members, she declared.

Moreover, the leader of any non-aligned country should, from the moment of being elected the chairman of such a broad international association, be a spokesman not only of his own country but also of the non-aligned movement as a whole. This means he, or she, should take into account the sentiments and tendencies prevailing in the movement, to refrain from assuming an ex-

treme left- or right-wing stance and to defend the common positions of the non-aligned movement even if the interests and positions of his, or her, own country disagree, or not entirely coincide, with it. Only in this way can the coordinating country and the Chairman expect to win prestige among the other non-aligned countries and fulfil their honourable mission.

No chairman, however, can thus develop a completely double-faced approach, and his political stance can influence the position and activities of the movement. The post of the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement gives the leader of a coordinating country fairly good opportunities to secure support for his country on international issues.

The 1970s and 1980s have shown that, despite a rather vague definition of the functions of the coordinating country and the Chairman, they have a big role to play in the movement and outside it. In fact they not only execute the agreed decisions adopted at non-aligned meetings but organize the collective diplomacy of these countries and act as spokesmen of the whole movement in the world arena. This mission, which is honourable and important, is confronted with great difficulties.

### **3. Conferences and Meetings of Foreign Ministers**

The fast changes in the international situation, the rapid growth of the number of non-aligned countries, the mounting difficulties in the work of coordinating their positions, and the fact that summit meetings are convened only once in three years made it necessary to call other authoritative non-aligned forums. The meetings of the foreign ministers of all the member countries have become second in importance after summit conferences. The documents adopted by the former mention two terms, "conference" and "meeting", for a definite reason.

The more important among ministerial forums are conferences attended by the foreign ministers of all non-aligned countries. They are convened between summit

conferences regularly, about 18 months after a conference and 18 months before the next one. The first ministerial conference was held in 1972 in Georgetown, Guyana which was followed by conferences convened in 1975 in Lima, Peru, in 1978 in Belgrade, in 1981 in Delhi, and in 1985 in Luanda, Angola. These conferences are convened by a decision of the highest forums of the movement. In 1979, the regularity of ministerial forums was fixed by a decision of the Havana Summit Conference.

Since then on, summit and intermediate ministerial conferences succeeded one another approximately every 18 months. A compromise solution was thus found for fulfilling the decision of the 1970 summit conference to ensure the continuity of action by convening summit conferences more frequently, depending on the prevailing international situation. It turned out to be impossible to gather the heads of state or government of numerous non-aligned countries more often than once in three years. The function of their additional meetings was assumed by the conferences of foreign ministers, or ministerial conferences, as they are called. Though formally the levels of these conferences are different, their importance for the non-aligned movement is actually the same. Like the highest forums, ministerial conferences make a general assessment of the world situation, chart the common line of the non-aligned countries in international political and economic matters, and solve organizational problems and those involved in the future activities of the movement.

Ministerial conferences discuss the implementation of the decisions taken at previous conferences and offer recommendations for the next summit forums, set practical tasks for other organs of the movement occupied with preparations for the coming meetings, and specify the date of their convocation. Their decisions on organizational matters may be as constructive as the corresponding decisions taken at the top-level forums. For example, the ministerial conference held in 1972 in Georgetown recommended to the member states that meetings of non-aligned countries be held regularly in

September at a ministerial level at the United Nations headquarters and, not waiting for a decision of the next summit conference due in 1973, fixed the time for the next such forums (1973 and 1974). It is assumed, naturally, that the next summit conference would approve the decisions of the ministerial conference post factum.

The September meetings of foreign ministers differ a good deal from ministerial conferences. First, these meetings have more limited functions. Their chief purpose is to discuss the agenda of a current session of the UN General Assembly and map out common tactics for the non-aligned countries on most pressing issues. This does not rule out, of course, an exchange of opinion on other international problems and adoption of relevant decisions on the future activities of the movement. Second, they are, in fact, meetings of foreign ministers and the heads of the delegations of non-aligned countries at UN General Assembly sessions. And third, such meetings are timed for the start of every next session of the UN General Assembly. This is why they are called September meetings, though they can be convened also in October. Their significance for the alignment of forces in the United Nations is obviously great, especially because they are held almost simultaneously with similar ministerial meetings of the Group of 77, at which the positions of all developing countries are coordinated.

Ministerial meetings are also held a short while before summit conferences and complete the preparations for these conferences, resolve problems related to organizational matters and the agenda, and agree on draft final documents after which the drafts are handed over for approval at the summit level.

There are also ministerial meetings attended by a limited number of delegates, most of them are held in the framework of the Coordinating Bureau of the movement. And, finally, there are meetings of just a few countries. There is a growing tendency of setting up ad hoc committees at a ministerial level dealing with most pressing political problems. Their functioning will be described later in this book.

#### 4. The Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN and the Coordinating Bureau of the Movement

Between summit forums and between ministerial conferences and meetings the most important political organs of the non-aligned movement are the *Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the United Nations* and the Coordinating Bureau. These are the main executive bodies organizing and coordinating the daily activities of the movement. They have a good deal in common but there is a great difference between them, too.

As compared with other groups of states, the non-aligned group is perhaps in a more difficult position, since it includes autonomous Arab and African groups, and, besides, there are the groups of developing countries (the Group of 77) and the groups of Islamic, Asian and Latin American countries operating outside the non-aligned movement. These groups include also other countries, apart from the non-aligned ones. They cooperate on many issues, though their positions not always coincide. Still, mutual influence is constant. The group of non-aligned countries is the second largest after the Group of 77 (about 130 countries), the largest in the UN. For this reason alone it is not easy to coordinate the positions of all its members.

There are two forms of its work—regular plenary meetings and special working, contact and editing committees and groups of limited representation. Plenary meetings are held at two levels—at the level of foreign ministers and permanent representatives to the United Nations. The September meetings of foreign ministers and other heads of the delegations of non-aligned countries in the UN General Assembly sessions may be regarded as plenary meetings of this group. Their chief mission is associated with current sessions of the UN General Assembly. However, the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN may debate and solve other questions as well.

The plenary meetings of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries at the level of permanent representatives to the UN, too, have no strictly limited functions and discuss priority tasks, possible proposals, positions and tac-

tics in the UN, and solve many current problems of the movement in the process. Beginning with 1981, one September meeting of the group has been regularly devoted to the Non-Alignment Day.

Much significance is attached to keeping the plenary meetings regular. According to a decision of the Havana Summit Conference, they should be held in New York, at least once in every two months, or frequently whenever necessary. Normally they are convened more often.

However, the most efficient among the collective political organs of the NAM is the *Coordinating Bureau*. Its sittings are much more frequent and the diversity of its political and organizational functions has made the Bureau a major element in the non-alignment mechanism.

The goals, tasks, the principles of staffing, the procedure of operation, and the place of the Coordinating Bureau in the non-aligned movement were defined most clearly in the decision regarding the composition and mandate of the Coordinating Bureau adopted at the Fifth Conference of the Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries held in 1976 in Colombo. The decision looks much like a charter of the Bureau and is of basic significance for its activity. The non-aligned forums that followed referred to this Colombo decision in their resolutions concerning the Bureau and invariably confirmed its main provisions, though they changed some of them (those concerning the rights of the Bureau non-members and the number of the members).

Article 1 of the document says that in the intervening period between summit conferences the Coordinating Bureau is the organ of non-aligned countries entrusted with the coordination of their joint activities aimed at implementing decisions and programmes adopted at summit conferences, ministerial meetings; meetings of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the United Nations and at other gatherings of non-aligned countries.

Article 4 says the functions of the Bureau are: to follow the implementation of the decisions adopted by the conferences of non-aligned countries; to ensure the coor-

dination of activities of non-aligned countries aimed at carrying out the said decisions; to carry out the preparations for conferences of heads of state or government, ministerial conferences and, if need be, other meetings of non-aligned countries; to hold Bureau meetings to consider international problems, special crisis situations of immediate common concern to the non-aligned countries, and to recommend appropriate actions and when necessary, to set up working or contact groups to assist in the implementation of the action programme in specific areas of economic cooperation among the non-aligned countries; to coordinate the joint activities of the non-aligned countries in the United Nations and contacts with the Group of 77; to maintain constant working contact with the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN, carry out the tasks it assigns to the Bureau and keep the Group continually informed of its activity. The Bureau may hold press conferences and issue press releases to inform the public about its activities and decisions.

But this decision, too, was not final and was later supplemented with new provisions. The Colombo meeting of the Coordinating Bureau in June 1979 recorded in its communique an important recommendation that the Bureau should assist in the peaceful settlement of disputes among non-aligned countries, if and when the parties concerned so request it. The Havana Summit Conference instructed the Bureau to review and facilitate the harmonization of the work of the growing number of organs, economic coordination groups, working groups, etc.; and to consider practical measures to ensure steady and organized dissemination of information among the public and the mass media regarding the previously agreed principles, positions and activities of the non-aligned. The Bureau, the decision says, should propose at every meeting or conference of non-aligned countries the organization of work and allocate items for consideration in accordance with a tentative time-table, encourage non-aligned countries to coordinate their activities and positions within the Group of 77 and UNCTAD, and give due consideration to concerted non-aligned action in special



<sup>F</sup> lized fields at international conferences.

The Colombo Summit Conference registered, and the Havana summit reaffirmed in its decision, the practice, existing since 1974, of calling Coordinating Bureau meetings at two levels—at the level of foreign ministers and that of permanent representatives to the United Nations. There exists, however, yet another level of meetings, when the Bureau acts as the Preparatory (Organizing) Committee before the convocation of summit forums of the movement. In these cases the Bureau holds sessions at the level of ambassadors or experts a few days before the summit and in its venue.

Regular ministerial meetings of the Bureau (just like the meetings of ministers and heads of delegations at the UN General Assembly sessions) were usually held once a year and extraordinary meetings were called when necessary. It was specified in Havana that the regular meetings of the Bureau at the level of ministers or special representatives should be called not annually but in the year of, and before, a Conference of Heads of State or Government. In keeping with that decision, only one regular ministerial meeting of the Coordinating Bureau was held between the Sixth and the Seventh Summit Conferences, and four extraordinary meetings of the Bureau were held at the ministerial level. The basic difference between them is that a wider range of problems are discussed and broader decisions are taken at regular meetings, while extraordinary meetings concentrate on more topical issues and developments.

The agenda of the Coordinating Bureau meetings at the level of permanent representatives of non-aligned countries in the central UN agencies in New York is more diverse and specific. Since the representatives of all the member countries of the Bureau sit in New York permanently, and not only during the UN General Assembly sessions, they can discuss any urgent issue of the international situation or the movement's activities and adopt a decision, issue a statement or table a proposal. At its New York sessions the Bureau discusses the current activities of the United Nations and of the non-aligned countries in the UN, and take measures to imple-

ment the decisions of the summit and ministerial forums of the movement.

Since the Coordinating Bureau performs simultaneously the functions of the Preparatory Committee, its meetings at the level of permanent representatives to the UN do the main job of coordinating the preparations for summit conferences and ministerial meetings. There have been instances when at these meetings the Coordinating Bureau acted as an ad hoc committee. Besides, in the Bureau itself there function various committees of experts, including economic and legal experts.

The New York meetings of the Bureau are most important in the NAM mechanism, for they are the most efficient collective working organ of the movement. It was decided at the Colombo summit in 1976 and at the Havana summit in 1979 that the meetings should be called regularly, once a month as a rule.

The meetings of the Group and the Coordinating Bureau of non-aligned countries are in many ways identical. The Chairman of the Bureau has been instructed to call meetings of the Group and the Bureau and offer an agenda for both. In practice, the number of their members remains almost the same.

This is due to the fact that, though only about one-third of all non-aligned countries were elected to the Coordinating Bureau at the outset (17 in 1973, 25 in 1976, and 36 in 1979), most of them have always displayed interest in attending its meetings. This interest was met at the Lima Ministerial Conference in 1975, which decided that any interested country might be admitted to the Coordinating Bureau. After that, the summit conferences in Colombo and Havana offered definite rights, such as the right to take part in the discussion of some issues and in adopting some decisions, to the countries which were not Bureau members. As a result, in 1979-1983, the period between the conferences in Havana and Delhi, for instance, when the Bureau should have included 36 countries, its meetings at the ministerial level were attended by 80 to 90 full members of the non-aligned movement, not counting observers and guests. The situation was much the same at the Bureau

meetings held in New York at the level of UN representatives.

This explains why the Delhi Summit Conference in 1983 officially increased the number of Bureau members to 74, that is, to almost three-fourths of all non-aligned countries. That conference also confirmed the Colombo and Havana formula by writing in its decision that all Coordinating Bureau meetings should be open-ended. However, as distinct from the Colombo and Havana summits, it in no way limited the rights of the other members of the movement (the Havana Conference admitted them to Bureau meetings on an equal footing for the consideration and decision of questions in which, in the opinion of the Bureau, they were directly involved).

This fact shows that intensive struggle is going on within the movement over its institutionalization, which is interpreted, for instance, in Yugoslavia as provision of free access and equal participation of all non-aligned countries in the entire work of the Bureau. Dr. Ranko Petković views this Delhi decision as a display of yet another specific of the non-aligned movement and its democratic spirit. As the movement develops, Petković says, its sole "executive body" has not turned into a centre of power within the movement, but has been, in fact, deprived of this power.

Nonetheless, whatever the vicissitudes of the struggle around the Bureau, its powers and composition, it was and remains to be a major general political coordinating body in the mechanism of the non-aligned movement.

This does not mean that any joint action by a number of non-aligned countries in the United Nations should necessarily be associated with the activities of the non-aligned movement and its bodies, such as the Coordinating Bureau. Practice has shown that at the UN General Assembly sessions and in the Security Council there may appear groups of non-aligned countries which do not coordinate their actions with the rest either at the plenary meetings of all member countries of the movement or at Coordinating Bureau meetings. This happens when positions within the NAM greatly diverge.

## **5. Permanent Bodies, Working Groups and Ad Hoc Committees**

The mechanism of the non-aligned movement, however, keeps developing, and permanent elements practically function in it already. The bodies for a peaceful settlement of conflicts are taking shape in the movement, too.

At present, all the main bodies within the non-aligned movement can be subdivided into sessional and non-formally permanent, that is, those which have not been declared permanent officially but operate on a permanent basis and have an executive machinery.

Among the former, evidently, are conferences of heads of state or government convened once in three years, conferences of foreign ministers also held once in three years, ministerial conferences convened either on the eve of summit forums or as September meetings in New York every year, plenary meetings of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the United Nations (held once in two months), and meetings of the Coordinating Bureau held every month. Each of these conferences or meetings is a regular or extraordinary session of some or another body. This view has been officially established in the numeration of non-aligned summit conferences: the first, second, third, and so on. But among the sessional bodies the Group of Non-Aligned Countries and the Coordinating Bureau in New York stand out for actually being continually functioning bodies, because the participants in their meetings are permanently present at the UN headquarters and may gather for a meeting at any time.

But if approached informally, the coordinating country and its representatives in the NAM—the Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, Chairman of the Meeting of Foreign Ministers and Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau—functioning daily in this capacity for three years, no matter whether sessions of some or other collective bodies of non-aligned countries are held or not, can be considered as permanent bodies of the movement. The capital of a coordinating country thus becomes the

unofficial headquarters of the non-aligned movement, and New York, where the entire group of non-aligned countries is permanently represented in the UN, is the site of the permanent branch office of the headquarters, since it does not change its place when another member state becomes a coordinating country.

The experience of all coordinating countries and chairmen of the movement has shown that their laborious functions demand a constant use of the foreign-policy machinery of the coordinating country. In this process the foreign minister actually does the work which is normally done by general secretaries of international organizations, while the staff of its foreign ministry acts as a secretariat of the movement, though officially they are not recognized as such.

The permanent mission of the non-aligned movement at the United Nations headquarters in New York occupies a somewhat more "legal" position. It performs the functions of the secretariat of the Coordinating Bureau and of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN, following the relevant decision of the Colombo Summit Conference in 1976, which says: "In keeping with the need for efficient functioning and coordination the Chairman of the Coordinating Bureau of the Non-Aligned Countries shall arrange for the provision of supporting services and facilities at his permanent mission at the United Nations Headquarters in New York supplemented, as necessary, by the permanent mission of other member countries of the Coordinating Bureau."<sup>1</sup>

This provision is registered partly also in the communiqué of the ministerial meeting of the Coordinating Bureau in Colombo in June 1979. It says: "Despite the increased function of coordination necessitated as a result of the growth in the number of subsidiary Working Groups, Coordinator Groups and other Committees, as well as the increased frequency of meetings at all levels, the Permanent Mission of the presiding country, Sri Lanka, has borne the responsibility for providing all secretarial services and facilities, including the preparation, reproduction and circulation of documents and other facilities required for the daily functioning of the

Movement's many activities."<sup>2</sup>

It is safe to say that precisely due to the use of the foreign-policy machinery of the coordinating country as a secretariat of the whole movement, this country, the Chairman of the Movement, and chairmen of the ministerial meetings and the Coordinating Bureau have the opportunity to perform the functions of permanent international bodies. The permanency lasts only three years, so long as the coordinating country presides over the movement. Then the role of the secretariat is handed down to the next presiding country. Still, viewed against the background of the sessional bodies of the movement, the daily work of the coordinating country and of the chairman during the three years looks well like permanent activity.

Apart from the general political permanent bodies and those functioning as regular and non-regular sessions, the non-aligned movement now has ad hoc committees set up for a definite term to carry out some specific mission, mostly that of settling disputes.

However, the activity of the non-aligned movement on specific disputes does not always require the setting up of a new body. In 1979, when the Arab countries proposed that the membership of Egypt under Sadat be suspended after the signing of the Camp-David accords and the separate Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty, the Havana Summit Conference instructed the Coordinating Bureau to act as an ad hoc committee on this issue. The same task was given to the Bureau when Kampuchea's representation in the non-alignment bodies was considered.

But the Coordinating Bureau rarely functions as an ad hoc committee, mainly when an important question of membership or representation in the non-aligned movement is to be decided. In other cases there is an increasing practice of setting up special ad hoc committees or groups for solving some or other problem and settling a conflict. But they, too, are subdivided according to what kind of conflicts they are to deal with, depending on whether only one conflicting side is in the movement or both.

## 6. Specialized Bodies

Apart from general political associations of non-aligned countries, there has emerged a network of economic and other specialized bodies which constitute an active part of the movement's mechanism. They have taken shape at the new stage of the national liberation movement—the stage of decolonization of the economy, information and other areas of development and also of international political and economic relations. All this has had important consequences.

First, precisely in this sphere there are the closest contacts and coordination of actions between the non-aligned and other developing countries, between the non-aligned movement and the Group of 77. Their joint conferences of ministers of finance, economy, labour, public health, information, etc. have been convened regularly for many years now. All the developing, including non-aligned, countries strive for solidarity in their efforts to restructure international economic relations on principles of equality and justice.

In accordance with a decision passed at the ministerial meetings of non-aligned and developing countries held in October 1982 in New York, the chairmen of the Group of 77 and the non-aligned movement coordinated the economic action programmes of both associations. To avoid duplication, so that one programme would complement the other, the priority tasks of economic cooperation among the developing countries were distributed between the programmes. It was recommended by both chairmen that the non-aligned movement should, as in the past, play the catalytic role for initiatives in the field of economic cooperation among developing countries, which could be given a concrete shape in operational terms by the Group of 77, particularly in the context of multilateral economic negotiations.

In 1983, the Summit Conference in Delhi accepted these recommendations and handed them down to the next ministerial conference for adopting an appropriate resolution, and decided that the Coordinating Bureau and the Group of 77 in New York should continue "to

the extent possible" to harmonize and coordinate the economic Programmes of Action adopted in the associations of non-aligned and developing countries.

The fact that the mechanism of the non-aligned movement is well suited to the historical process of completing the decolonization of the newly-free countries and of their international relations has produced yet another result. In this sphere, which is vital for all non-aligned countries, the tasks became more specific, which was expressed in a paradoxical fact: some of the specialized bodies formed in the non-aligned movement by the decisions of the general political bodies which had been set up earlier notably advanced in organizational terms and resemble international organizations far more than the movement as a whole.

This comparatively greater organizational improvement of the specialized bodies is far from being complete, of course, and some of them exist only on paper so far, in the decisions of the non-aligned forums. But it is safe to say already now that its institutionalization in special fields is going on much faster than in the general political area, though the links between them certainly remain firm. This is a stable trend.

On the whole, the goals of all the specialized bodies are the economic decolonization and social progress of the non-aligned countries, and the establishment of all-round cooperation among these countries. But each of the bodies has its own sphere of activity and its own organizational mechanism.

*Multilateral cooperation among non-aligned countries in the mass media* and in the efforts to decolonize information and to establish a new international information order is organized by:

- the General Conference of Ministers of Information and Heads of Press Agencies of Non-Aligned Countries (the supreme body);

- the Inter-Governmental Coordination Council on Information and Mass Media of Non-Aligned Countries (the leading coordinating body);

- the Pool of News Agencies of Non-Aligned Countries,



or Non-Aligned News Agency Pool (has a charter and a coordinating committee);

the International Telecommunication Union and Administrative Radio Conferences, its supreme body being the administrative radio conferences of non-aligned countries (has a coordinating committee).

The information bodies of the non-aligned movement are interconnected, of course, and their efforts to show world developments as they see them, and not through foreigners' eyes, are coordinated.

*The organs coordinating the economic diplomacy* of non-aligned countries in restructuring international economic relations and establishing a new international economic order and in the promotion of trade, economic, scientific, technological and cultural cooperation among these countries are most numerous. In accordance with the action programmes often adopted at non-aligned summits, this coordination is now conducted in 22 fields, from tourism and insurance to raw materials and currency problems, with a coordinating body for each field.

The meetings of ministers of finance and economy, ministers of labour and public health of non-aligned and other developing countries are held regularly. General political verification of the implementation of the action programmes for economic cooperation is conducted by the Coordinating Bureau. Special control is effected in each field of economic cooperation by groups of coordinating countries which, on top of that, offer their recommendations of future measures and actions. The work of all coordinating groups is conducted in the form of sessions at various levels—from ministers to experts. Some of them are held irregularly, though.

It has been decided also to set up a number of councils, centres and financial funds for the economic cooperation of non-aligned and other developing countries, but most of them do not function as yet because of financial difficulties or for other reasons. This concerns, in particular, the Documentation Centre of Non-Aligned Countries in Colombo, Sri Lanka.

However, there has been obvious progress in cooperation among non-aligned countries in information and in

the social sphere, though not as big as planned. Of great importance for the future of South-South cooperation are the NAM's efforts to coordinate its activities with those of the Group of 77 in which the member states of the movement make up the overwhelming majority.

\* \* \*

The unification of non-aligned countries, which began with sporadic meetings and, having gone through the stage when its permanent mechanism was formed and strengthened, reached a point in the 1980s at which the prospects of the non-aligned movement as an institution in the system of international relations are determined.

The conflict of opposite ideas within the movement, which has always been expressed in the unwillingness to "be a bloc" and a wish to coordinate the activities of non-aligned countries and to build up their unity, are still there. The new process of institutionalizing the movement—the creation of a more clear-cut organizational structure—is developing in spite of the former trend, because the non-aligned movement cannot act without any organizational structure at all, even if this structure is all too different from that of a bloc. However, this process is being deliberately checked.

A decision of the Havana Summit Conference envisages, in particular, that no proposals for the establishment of new organs, mechanisms or programmes should be considered by the Conference of Heads of State or Government unless their feasibility and productivity have been carefully studied at expert level and reviewed by the Coordinating Bureau. This decision, not stopping the institutionalization process, places it under strict control.

Among the host of proposals appearing now and again on the agenda of the movement's forums most important are those concerning the setting up of its permanent secretariat and a Commission for the Settlement of Border Disputes within the Non-Aligned Countries. In the situation of increased international tensions, when the participants in the movement attach ever more importance to preserving and building up their unity, many of them

believe these problems must be solved without delay. But not all of them think so. There are apprehensions that a permanent secretariat, or any other institutional body for that matter, could bring more discord in the movement. When asked in an interview if it was possible to set up a permanent secretariat of the movement, Indira Gandhi said it was too early to think about it.

As the non-aligned and other developing countries lose hope of winning the favour of the imperialist powers and monopolies in the North-South dialogue, they bank increasingly on collective self-reliance along the South-South line. But solution of hard economic problems in this new sphere will require no less organization than in the political sphere. At present, the process of institutionalization in economic cooperation among developing countries proceeds in the framework of the two associations—the Group of 77 and the non-aligned movement. It is hard to say, yet, how long this process will be divided, but one thing is clear now: once it has started, it is not going to stop. And the non-aligned movement will inevitably facilitate its continuation.

The further development of the organizational mechanism of the non-aligned movement is undoubtedly most important to the countries in the movement. The search is under way for a structure in which the bodies cementing the unity of the movement would be best suited to the procedure of activities enabling the member countries to retain full equality, and free choice of a foreign-policy stand and tactics. This search in the coming years will determine the development of the non-aligned movement as an institution in the system of international relations.

### ***Chapter Two. The Procedure of Operation of the Non-Aligned Movement and Its Bodies***

Though the non-aligned movement has neither a charter nor an all-embracing procedure, a definite mode of operation is gradually taking shape in the movement.

All the procedural and organizational matters of the

movement and its bodies are regulated by the rules partly fixed in the decisions of its forums and partly established in the course of practical activities and in concrete precedents.

All this makes it harder, of course, to study the mode of operation of the non-aligned movement, but this does not mean that a procedure and procedural regulations, including those legally registered, are totally absent in the movement.

The uneven development of the mode of operation is typical of the movement: some of its aspects had been determined earlier, others later, and still others are just taking shape. Some problems were solved in the 1960s, and most of the others only in the 1970s and are still being solved as the movement and its organizational structure are developing.

### **1. Participation in the Non-Aligned Movement and Representation at Its Forums**

Of all the questions related to the movement, precisely these came up first. What country can be regarded as non-aligned? This important question was answered way back before the first conference in Belgrade, when the criteria of the non-alignment policy were to be formulated and when it was to be decided what countries were to be invited to the conference.

The objective status and policy of a country wishing to join the non-aligned movement should necessarily suit the criteria established for membership. Besides, there is a status of observer (since 1961) and guest (since 1970), on which definite, though milder, demands are placed. However, no strict distinction between the statuses and no definition of the rights and duties of full members, observers and guests have been registered in a single document issued by the NAM.

In practice, which follows from the official documents of the movement, its full members take part in conferences and meetings, while observers and guests are just present there. The actual difference between these statuses is that full members may participate in any kind of the

movement's activity, address its forums and take part in adopting their decisions, that is, they have a deciding vote, while observers may be present and make speeches, that is, have a deliberative vote, and guests may just be present at non-alignment forums. Besides, a "special" status can be granted to a state, giving it the right to address a forum, but not making it a member state or observer officially (this was the status of Belize before it acquired independence in 1981).

The status of full members of the NAM may be given to independent states and national liberation movements. In 1986, 99 states and 2 national liberation movements—the PLO and SWAPO—had this status. The status of observer may be, and is, given to independent states and to national liberation and international organizations; and the status of guest, to independent states and international organizations. However, the African National Congress and the Pan-African Congress, the rivaling liberation movements of South Africa, which is a UN member, are both present at non-aligned forums as observers, and among the guests are not only some neutral European countries but also members of military-political alliances, that is, "bloc countries", as, for instance, Romania and Portugal. At the Seventh Summit Conference in Delhi in 1983, Spain, which by that time had joined the political organization of NATO, had the guest status.

The admission of a country or organization to the movement with one or another status does not mean it must take part in all its meetings. As a rule, some of the full members, observers and guests are absent at a meeting. Besides, many delegations of non-aligned countries (though less than a half) at the Conferences of Heads of State or Government are headed by vice-presidents, princes, deputy prime ministers, ministers and even ambassadors, naturally with appropriate powers. The situation may be the same also at the conferences or meetings of foreign ministers.

Participation in the non-aligned movement in any capacity is voluntary. When at a sitting of the Havana summit in 1979 the head of the Burmese delegation

suddenly announced his country's withdrawal from the non-aligned movement, this did not shock the delegates. Incidentally, that was the only case of a country leaving the movement in all its history.

There have been instances when a state's request to take part, one way or another, in the movement was turned down. In 1975, for instance, the Coordinating Bureau refused the request of South Korea to admit it to the non-aligned movement on the grounds that South Korea could not be regarded as non-aligned, and in 1983 the Bureau refused to grant the status of observer to Honduras, which had close military ties with Washington, though Honduras had a guest status in the past (1975).

The *question of representation* at the NAM forums of a non-aligned country, in which a coup has been staged (and this is known to happen quite frequently in young states) sometimes becomes very acute. In this case the association of non-aligned countries has to decide whether the former or the new government is to be invited to a meeting. On the whole, there is a tendency to recognize states and governments having real power but, as practice has shown, this question can be decided otherwise, depending on the circumstances.

For instance, the Cairo Summit Conference in 1964 turned off Moise Tshombe, the puppet prime minister of the Congo, who had been involved in the assassination of Patrice Lumumba but dared to arrive at the conference as the head of the Congolese delegation. Tshombe and the delegation of his government were sent back home straight from the airport. Only after Tshombe was deposed were the delegations of that country readmitted to the movement's forums.

In 1975, the military junta in Chile, which had overthrown the constitutional government of Salvador Allende and trampled underfoot democracy in the country, was strongly denounced at the Lima Conference of Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Countries, which formally did not mean expulsion of Chile from the NAM but was actually a refusal to invite the junta's delegates to non-aligned forums. Thus the junta was debarred from

participating in the NAM, and this decision was confirmed at the subsequent forums, to which the Chilean delegation was not invited, of course. The delegates to the Delhi Summit Conference in 1983 voiced support for the legitimate aspirations of the Chilean people to restore their fundamental freedoms and human rights and the non-aligned course set by President Allende.

The question of representation of some or other country in the NAM grows even more acute in case of a protracted armed conflict in a country between the government forces and those opposed to them, which often leads to dual power in the country or to the formation of a government in exile. In this case the member states of the movement are also divided over the issue, which gravely affects its settlement, even if the membership of the country in the movement is not disputed. In such a situation a good deal depends on the position of the host country.

The solution of the question concerning the representation of Kampuchea involved great difficulties in the late 1970s, when the people's uprising in that country smashed the Pol Pot regime with the help of friendly Vietnam. Many non-aligned countries found it hard to make a decision on Kampuchea's representation not only because they came under heavy pressure from the USA and China which insisted that the new government should not be recognized and Vietnam's "armed interference" be denounced. The Havana Summit Conference denied the Pol Pot regime, toppled by the Kampuchean people, the right to attend its sittings but failed to come to a consensus on handing down its seat to the People's Republic of Kampuchea. The conference declared: "As long as there is no decision on which of the parties has the right to the vacant seat, neither of the parties shall claim its alleged rights in any organ of the Movement."<sup>3</sup> The confirmation of that decision by the Delhi summit in 1983 was a generally accepted compromise. But this question has not been removed from the agenda and remains among the most acute issues for future non-aligned forums.

## **2. The Procedure for Fixing the Venue and Time of Summit Forums, and for Setting Up the Coordinating Bureau and Its Operation**

The procedure for fixing the venue and time of summit conferences and meetings has taken shape in practice, formalized in the movement's decisions, and is being gradually improved. But even so, it is far from always obligatory for all.

Thus, the non-aligned countries had to decide on the time and place of the first three summit conferences in each particular case. It was only in the 1970s that such conferences began to be called regularly once in three years as sessions of the top-level forums of the movement.

And each time when a venue is to be chosen for the next conference, the member countries rival for the right to be the host. This rivalry intensified still more after 1970, when a host country presiding over a conference was regarded as a coordinating country and its leader as chairman of the whole non-aligned movement until the next conference. Sometimes the countries "cue up" for being chosen the host.

This made it possible to plan the convocation of the meetings of the main organs of the movement for years ahead and to pass decisions on the venue for subsequent forums. It became necessary, however, to regulate the incoming offers. To make it all easier, it was decided that the regions of the world, in which the conferences are held, should be rotated. But it proved impossible to keep strictly to this rule.

If a regular conference is put off for some reason, the powers of the coordinating country and the chairman of the movement are automatically extended. It is also significant that when the head of state or government is replaced in the coordinating country during the term of its powers, it may still continue to perform its functions in the non-aligned movement and its new leader may be regarded by the other non-aligned countries as the NAM chairman.

The procedure of setting up the Coordinating Bureau



and its operations was established in the course of practical activities and then fixed in the NAM documents. In accordance with the above-mentioned decisions adopted in 1976-1979, the Coordinating Bureau was elected by summit conferences, with due account of the principles of balanced geographical distribution, continuity and rotation. This principle is applied also for the election of other executive bodies of the movement, such as the Coordinating Committee of the Pool of News Agencies of Non-Aligned Countries.

The application of this principle means that most of the seats in the Coordinating Bureau are occupied by African countries which constitute the largest regional group in the NAM. When the composition of the Bureau was decided upon at the Delhi Summit Conference in 1983, Africa was given 36 of the 74 seats; Asia, 23; Latin America, 12, and Europe, 3 seats. But it is the European countries that have the largest number of seats in the Bureau today. The whole group of these countries is in the Bureau. The Bureau includes even Cyprus, which geographically is in Asia.

In keeping with a decision of the Fifth Summit Conference held in 1976, any member of the Coordinating Bureau and any other non-aligned country has the right to request the convening of a meeting of the Coordinating Bureau, and if the majority of the Bureau members in New York back up this request, then the chairman should call a meeting. The Bureau may hold meetings not only in New York and in the capitals of its member states, but also in the capitals of other non-aligned countries.

### **3. Preparations for Summit and Ministerial Forums**

The summit and ministerial forums of the movement are prepared for in due time both in the framework of the movement as a whole and in the host country.

Soon after a conference of foreign ministers and heads of state or government, all the organs of the movement start preparations for the next one. It all begins with drawing up reports on the implementation of the previous

decisions and on the activity of the movement's organs. As the next conference approached, the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN and the Coordinating Bureau drew up its agenda, considering current developments and problems, issued recommendations and conducted organizational work, and heard reports on all aspects of the preparations. In this process the Coordinating Bureau acts as the Organizing Committee.

During the practical preparations for summit and ministerial meetings the government and the ruling party of each non-aligned country plan in detail their position and tactics at the forthcoming forum with due account of all political, economic, external and internal factors. Bilateral contacts between the governments of non-aligned countries and visits at different levels become more frequent. Positions are coordinated also at the multilateral meetings of non-aligned countries during the sessions of organizations like the OAU, Islamic Conference and ASEAN. Already during these sessions the alignment and balance of forces at a forthcoming forum as a whole is determined.

Most of the work during the preparations for a conference is done in the year of its convocation by the coordinating country and the host country. Performing its duties, the coordinating country organizes the last preparatory meetings of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN and the Coordinating Bureau, draws up a report on the activities of the movement during the time passed since the previous forum, helps the new host country to draft final documents, and settles differences at numerous talks with other countries. Apart from drafting the documents of a future forum, the host country has to solve dozens of most difficult political, and also organizational, problems to preserve solidarity among the delegates and to ensure the success of the forum.

Not all non-aligned countries can afford to finance the preparations for, and convocation of, such forums. The country in which a summit or ministerial conference is held bears most of the expenses. Part of the expenses is shared by other non-aligned countries, though, as has al-

ready been said, the movement has neither a fixed budget nor membership dues.

#### 4. Decision-Making Procedure

*The procedure of drawing up and adopting decisions at the meetings and conferences of all organs of the non-aligned movement has from the outset been based on the consensus principle.*

Evidently, the social and political diversity among the member states and, at the same time, obvious proximity or community of their main international interests, and their awareness that unity is vital to them, decided their choice of these methods and not others, like the adoption of decisions by a simple or qualified majority vote. However, like many other elements in the NAM mechanism, the consensus method was initially tested and improved in practical activities, and only in the late 1970s was it defined and recorded in official documents of the movement.

What is consensus in the non-aligned movement? Can it be seen as decision-making without voting, in the absence of objections (on the "silence gives consent" principle), or is it unanimity?

As in other international associations, in the non-aligned movement consensus cannot be regarded as any of these, and no clear interpretation of consensus has been produced so far within the movement. The first attempt to define it in an official document, made in 1979 first at the ministerial meeting of the Coordinating Bureau in Colombo and then at the Havana Summit Conference, resulted in this formulation: "Consensus has a certain indefinable quality hard to express in words although we all know instinctively what it means."<sup>4</sup>

However, according to the explanations offered in the decision of the Havana Conference on this question, the non-aligned countries understand consensus as "mutual accommodation on the basis of which agreement can emerge by a sincere process of adjustment among member nations ..., a process and a final compromise formula

... a general convergence and harmonization of views reflecting the broadest consent of the Conference or meeting".<sup>5</sup> The purpose of applying the consensus method, it said, for decision-making in the non-aligned movement is "enhancing, or, at least, preserving the unity and strength of the Movement".<sup>6</sup>

Perhaps the most significant question for understanding consensus in any international association, including the non-aligned movement, is whether it is correct to identify consensus with unanimity and how many votes are required for a veto.

The NAM has to deal with this question at all its forums, be it a summit conference, a conference or meeting of foreign ministers, a plenary meeting of the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN, a sitting of the Coordinating Bureau, or a session of any other body. In this connection the Havana summit adopted an important decision which says that "the practice of allowing reservations on decisions adopted at Meetings and Conferences of Non-Aligned Countries is continued". It was stressed at the same time that "reservations cannot block or veto a consensus". Thus, the Havana Conference replied, albeit partly, to one of the most burning questions concerning consensus.

A fuller, though controversial, answer to these questions has been offered by practice based on the long-used guiding principle, fixed only in the decision of the Havana Conference, according to which "open confrontations between opposing views threatening to disrupt the Movement should be avoided, but discussion of issues may be necessary in order to overcome differences". The decision says also that "the presence of strong opposing views is an indication that the matter under discussion is highly sensitive and hence a special effort should be made to try to accommodate all views to achieve the broadest consent of the Conference/Meeting".<sup>7</sup>

The practice of non-alignment has shown that it is not exactly correct to assert that accommodation of the positions of member states without voting is characteristic of consensus. The experience of non-aligned conferences and meetings shows that consensus and voting cannot be

sharply opposed to each other, and the question of the representation of Kampuchea (at several successive forums) shows this only too well. It indicates that the consensus principle in the non-aligned movement operates not only at the stage of decision-making but even earlier, when the decision is being drawn up. One may say that, in a sense, the states vote "permanently" in the process.

The required extent of the harmonization of the positions of states (in the absence of substantial objections) is achieved at the stage when a decision is being drawn up, and by the time of its adoption the attitude of the member states to it is already known. At the sittings of the Political and Economic Committees during the Delhi Summit Conference the delegations tabled as many as 257 written amendments to India's draft political declaration and 253 amendments to India's draft economic declaration. The adoption of final documents at the movement's forums by acclamation confirms that, when the consensus principle is applied, traditional voting proves unnecessary.

When it concerns a moot question, especially when most interested delegations holding opposite views are divided into roughly equal groups, while the rest of the delegations sit and wait what all this will come to and show no interest in the argument and support neither side, it is appropriate to ask: who can say, after all, whether there is consensus or not?

Whether a consensus is reached or not largely depends on the experience and diplomatic skill of the chairman of a forum, its committees, subcommittees and working groups. And when some or other decision is stubbornly opposed by several delegations, the responsibility for determining whether there is a consensus or not rests with the chairman.

Many non-aligned delegations asked how many objections—ten, twenty or more—would negate a consensus *de facto*. But, according to a Yugoslav journal, "this approach was soon rejected, for this meant going over to calculating votes and, *de facto*, to a kind of voting, which would be essentially alien to the policy and movement of non-alignment".<sup>8</sup>

The NAM has become still more tolerant to reservations on some documents it adopts. Though the Havana Summit Conference called on the member states to avoid reservations as far as possible because "they tend to weaken the consensus", it stressed at the same time that the mechanism of making reservations ensures the maintenance of the democratic character of the movement and sovereignty of its every member.<sup>9</sup>

It has become a rule with the NAM that each member country may submit its reservations not only during a meeting or conference but about a month after it. The reservations are submitted officially, in writing, and are addressed to the chairman of a conference or meeting. Thus, after the ministerial conference in February 1981, 37 countries tabled reservations on its declaration, and after the meeting of the Coordinating Bureau at the ministerial level, held in June 1982 in Havana, 49 countries submitted reservations, including some of the countries which were not Bureau members. Nonetheless, all the decisions of these forums remained in force and were regarded to have been adopted by consensus.

Evidently the existing procedure of decision-making by consensus suits the non-aligned countries. Consensus, as a rule, helps them to arrive at compromise solutions in deadlock situations when the delegates hold opposite views on an issue or when confusion sets in. Even when most acute argument erupted among non-aligned countries, and when a failure of their summits and a disintegration of the movement were forecast, none of the conferences ended earlier than planned, none of them proved unproductive, and the discussions at all of them led to mutually acceptable solutions, all of which is the case for consensus.

But then what is the practical value of the decisions adopted by consensus, decisions which are sometimes pretty vague, with a host of reservations to them? And what are the political and legal consequences of such decision-making for the non-aligned countries themselves?

Seeking answers to all these natural questions, one should know that the significance and effectiveness of any international decision depend not on the way it is

adopted but on the objective necessity for, and possibility of, its implementation by the member countries, on the political will of these countries to achieve its implementation, and on the international commitments they assume. The NAM has neither a charter nor any agreements making it binding on its members to implement the decisions made. Most resolute demands placed on the member countries of the movement, registered in the documents of its meetings, are regarded by the non-aligned countries merely as recommendations.

Not a single document of the NAM envisages sanctions for a failure or refusal to fulfil its decisions. Even an open violation of concrete and repeatedly confirmed decisions of the movement's summit conferences can entail no sanctions, only moral censure. The unsuccessful attempts of the Arab countries to suspend the membership of Sadat's Egypt in the movement for the violation of the Middle East decisions are a clear proof of this.

So the decisions of non-aligned forums are not obligatory for individual members and have no legal force—this is the conclusion offered by the long practice of the movement and its bodies at all levels, including the summit level. This cannot be said, however, about political consequences of the decisions made.

No one will deny that joint decisions oblige to some extent every NAM member to act accordingly, and influence its foreign policy. Any non-aligned country takes into account the agreed decision of the other members when determining its stance on specific international issues. In some cases the feeling of solidarity with the majority of countries in the movement prevails over national interests or other international commitments. Even when a non-aligned country assumes a position different from others or violates some or other decision, it acts circumspectly, limiting its departure from the common stand.

Political consequences of the NAM decisions are increasingly felt in international affairs. This is most obvious at the sessions of the UN General Assembly and other UN bodies which more often than not are convened at the initiative of non-aligned countries acting in accordance with their joint decisions. The draft resolutions

drawn up in the Group of Non-Aligned Countries in the UN now often serve as a basis for UN resolutions. In September 1983, responding to the call of the Delhi Summit Conference, a meeting of the heads of state or government of about twenty non-aligned and other countries of the world was held under the chairmanship of Indira Gandhi in New York during the 38th Session of the UN General Assembly. At the meeting the delegates exchanged views on topical issues of peace, development and disarmament. This is just one recent instance of the effectiveness of the decisions passed by the NAM.

Therefore these decisions—even if they are arrived at through a good deal of compromise—and mainly their implementation make the movement a major international political force, which cannot be ignored by any one today.

\* \* \*

The composition and the geographical area of the NAM are expanding and its organizational structure is growing more intricate, which inevitably leads to the establishment of a more definite procedure of the operation of the movement as a whole and of its every organ, and to greater regulation of the interrelationship between them. Otherwise, the mechanism of the movement could become too bulky and cumbersome. But the path to such improvement is far from smooth.

This movement cannot, and could not, of course, be a kind of a political monolith, and differences will remain in it. But in this sense it is no exception. "Is there greater unity in, say, the NATO alliance or the European Economic Community both of which are, unlike to non-aligned movement, meticulously planned organisations held together by a framework of treaties, institutions and decision-making structures?", *The Times of India* had good reason to ask.<sup>10</sup>

As the NAM develops and is confronted with new problems, the differences among its member states do not become less acute. In the past years such questions of the movement's activity as the possibility of influencing



the full members which do not abide by its principles and decisions, the elaboration of regulations to suspend their membership, the terms of preserving a seat of some non-aligned country vacant in the movement—questions which at first seem procedural—acquired a political significance under the impact of the developments in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. A number of non-aligned countries demand today that the procedural regulations of the movement on these and other burning issues of the day should be more specific. But stricter regulations, in the opinion of other member countries, could “scare off” some countries and are hardly advisable.

The history of non-alignment shows that it is too hard to elaborate a common stand while member states hold so different opinions; that diplomacy used within the movement during the settlement of differences is not less, but perhaps even more, intricate than the joint diplomacy of the non-aligned countries on the world scene. And the position of the non-aligned countries, which is far from always a “common stand”, reflects their actual unity and is positive, while a “special” opinion of some of them harms this unity and is, therefore, negative.

Even a consensus at a summit conference of non-aligned countries on some or other issue does not guarantee their unity at the UN during the voting on this issue. This happened in the past and may happen in future. As a result of this, for instance, the seat of Kampuchea in the United Nations is still occupied by Pol Pot men, though they have been deprived of this right in the non-aligned movement. This difference of opinion among a number of non-aligned countries at the NAM meetings and in the UN most frequently comes up when anti-American decisions are adopted. What should be the attitude to this phenomenon?

Evidently there is enough reason to agree, in particular, with the conclusion made by *The Times of India* that in these cases one should take into account in what situation and in what way a decision is adopted in the NAM and in the UN. At the NAM meetings and conferences, where there is no voting and decisions are adopted by consensus, the non-aligned countries really express their own

free will, while "voting at the U.N. takes place under the vigilant eye of ... the U.S. permanent representative" who makes the granting of US aid to a developing country dependent on the way the country concerned votes in the U.N., along with or against the United States.<sup>11</sup>

The NAM does not stand still, it is not isolated and cannot distance itself from other world forces. Its development is associated with solving pressing issues of international relations. A correct understanding of the internal mechanism and the mode of operation of the movement enables one to assess more realistically both the results already achieved and the prospects before the association of non-aligned countries.

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 222.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 386.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 433.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Review of International Affairs*, Belgrade, No. 713, December 20, 1979, p. 14.

<sup>9</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 474.

<sup>10</sup> *The Times of India*, February 24, 1983, p. 8.

<sup>11</sup> *The Times of India*, March 16, 1983, p. 8.

### III

## WHAT UNITES THE NON-ALIGNED COUNTRIES

The non-aligned movement is a mosaic of states with different social systems, united by common national and state interests. The movement has always been a general democratic association, and cannot be anything else. All the more so since the common interests of its members are based primarily on the community or similarity of their historical destinies and social and economic positions. This objective factor reveals itself, one way or another, in the policy of any government, whatever its orientation may be.

The historical background of the non-aligned countries accounts for their striving for peace and peaceful coexistence. Their peacefulness stems from both their concern for the future and the hard experience they had in the past. Having gone through the hardships of World War II, they value peace no less than other peace-loving countries. In the struggle to prevent a new war their interests coincide so much that, cementing the association of the non-aligned countries, they make it a major anti-war force, a significant part of the peace movement today.

But this uniting factor, however important it is, would still be not enough to ensure the development of the non-aligned movement and its becoming a serious political force of our time. These countries have also other, no less important, common interests deeply rooted in their past. This is evidenced by the problems which confront them and influence their positions, and, of course, by their common attitude to these problems which is epitomized in the decisions taken at non-aligned forums. To understand the ideology of non-alignment one is to know the main decisions formulating the guidelines for the movement.

## *Chapter One. On the Way from the Past to the Future*

It is an old philosophical truth that in the development of any social phenomenon there always are vestiges of the past, the basic features of the present, and rudiments of the future. It is commonly known that the concept, policy and movement of non-alignment originated and is developing in the historical process of national liberation and disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism. This, above all, explains why the overwhelming majority of non-aligned countries—former colonies or semi-colonies—have identical interests and pool their efforts for joint actions. This was so in the past and is an objective reality at present.

This is so because the wreckage of formerly great colonial empires has not yet been swept away from a few dozen islands and other small territories, because there still exist the racist regime in South Africa and the puppet regimes in Namibia, Micronesia and Puerto Rico. In historical terms these last products of the colonial epoch are all doomed and sooner or later people will wipe them off the face of the earth.

This is so because on its way out colonialism has left deep scars on the face of our planet like a huge retreating glacier of the long-gone ice age. Today, too, the colonial past of newly independent states can be judged not only by exhibits in museums, but by numerous problems confronting the peoples and governments of these states every day. In various countries the extent and nature of colonial aftermath are different; of course, but they are present in all of them.

Numerous facts indicate that the non-aligned countries and other young states have launched a stubborn struggle for their complete and final emancipation, for the so-called second liberation—the elimination of colonialism also in the economy and other spheres of development and international relations mined by colonialism. It becomes increasingly obvious that the profound process of removing whatever there remains after the colonial period of national oppression, inequality and exploiter relations is steadily gaining momentum. The influence of this process

on the international interests of the young states and the activity of the non-aligned movement is so great and diverse that it is hardly possible to make a proper assessment of the development and prospects of the movement in all spheres without duly analysing this process.

### **1. Myths and Reality**

To begin with, the collapse of the colonial empires and the smashing of colonial regimes was a historical milestone in the national liberation movement. As they formed their national states, the peoples of India, Cuba, Algeria and other former colonies and semi-colonies consolidated their sovereignty, diversified their international ties, and achieved notable progress in the economic sphere, in creating a public education system and in some other areas of development, that is to say, in a very brief period of history they achieved far more than during dozens and even hundreds of years of foreign rule.

The experience of many countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania confirms, however, that under the guise of granting political independence the imperialists made these states dependent on them economically, financially and militarily. The Havana Summit Conference in 1979 had every reason to describe this situation as the "perpetuation of the old colonial relations in their original form or under various disguises or attempts at the imposition of new relations of dependence and subjugation".<sup>1</sup> But these relations of dependence and subjugation were nothing new, they did not appear just after the colonies became states. They were the same old relations of dependence and subjugation which arose in the epoch of colonial empires and were only adapted to the new situation. Today, the entire system of neocolonialism rests on them.

On closer examination it appears that there is more in common than different between neocolonialism and the old colonial system. Like old-time colonialism, neocolonialism rests on discrimination against, and exploitation of, the countries and peoples of southern continents. The

colonialists persist in and even intensify their policy of exploiting developing countries and continue to encroach on the freedom and independence of young states. Regardless of the prefix "neo", the concept of "neocolonialism" means primarily connection with the colonial past. A declaration of the Third Summit Conference of the non-aligned movement held in 1970 in Lusaka, Zambia, said that "classical colonialism is trying to perpetuate itself in the garb of neo-colonialism—a less obvious but in no way a less dangerous means of economic and political domination over the developing countries".<sup>2</sup> One can hardly disagree with this.

It is most important to note that colonialism, whatever name it takes, has always been an integral part of world capitalism, an endemic element of its exploiter system. Capitalist powers and monopolies are in a position to pursue a policy of neocolonialism with regard to newly-free states precisely because these states, like the colonies in the past, and the West remain in the same system of world capitalist economy, though on opposite poles. Therefore any attempt to look for neocolonialists outside the capitalist system, among its adversaries (and that is what anti-Sovietes of all shades are doing) is groundless.

Hence the struggle against all forms of colonialism is a struggle waged within the world capitalist system, and the term "North-South", which has become so widespread in recent years, is applicable to the relations between the developing countries on the one hand, no matter if they are in the southern or northern hemisphere, and the developed capitalist states on the other. Experience has shown us that the goal of this struggle is to smash all that has remained of the system of colonial oppression and what is used by the neocolonialists as a jumping-off ground.

The analysis of the present situation in the developing countries and of their relations with the imperialist powers shows that even after the collapse of the colonial empires it is too early to say that decolonization and national liberation revolutions have been accomplished, even if this fact is not recognized by some people.

All the non-aligned countries realize how important it is to achieve complete and all-round decolonization. "The people's freedom and independence will not be truly consolidated until the state of domination, dependency and exploitation is ended," says the Political Declaration issued by the 1979 Havana Conference.<sup>3</sup>

The more time passes since the toppling of a colonial regime in a developing country, the more obvious it becomes that its struggle for complete decolonization is now directed not only against a former colonial power, but also against other imperialist powers, monopolies and their associations, since they all try to preserve the vestiges of colonialism to suit their own ends. This is most clearly manifest in the young states' demands for equitable international political and economic relations.

What is, for instance, behind their demand for a new international economic order based on fair and democratic principles? Above all, a demand addressed to the whole imperialist world for changing the system of unequal economic relations established between the developing and industrialized countries within the world capitalist economy in the years of colonial rule.

All newly independent countries have joined the effort finally to do away with the colonial past. After the Cuban revolution raised the torch of freedom in Latin America, its peoples sharply stepped up the struggle for their "second liberation", for the right to be masters in their own home and to use their national wealth at their discretion, the struggle against US imperialism and its monopolies, and against the old order in political and economic relations among countries. It is symptomatic that even the countries whose governments have formally declared decolonization to be accomplished continue their fight for a complete elimination of colonial oppression and its vestiges.

The course towards final decolonization is at present a major area of activity of most governments of the non-aligned countries and of the non-aligned movement as a whole.

## **2. Anachronisms of the Colonial System of Oppression and Exploitation**

What are the vestiges of colonial oppression today and how are the equality and independence of the peoples encroached upon? The manifestations of colonialism and neocolonialism are diverse, stated the Cairo Conference of Non-Aligned Countries.

There exist about twenty seats of colonialism and racism with known area and populations. This atavism of the colonial past cannot be disguised by imperialist propaganda, no matter how hard it may try to do this. The last remaining seats of colonialism and racism and, moreover, their use by imperialism for aggressive purposes are a dangerous source of social, political and military tension in international relations today. The situation in the south of Africa is a clear indication of this.

The legacy of colonialism is also felt acutely in most of the countries which have already won state independence. It would be an exaggeration, of course, to lump all the blame on the colonialists and their legacy. But there is no reason to belittle the fact that the dire consequences of colonial oppression make themselves felt today too, paralyzing the young states.

It is hard even to list all the consequences of the colonial past—they are too numerous. Here are the main of them.

First, the most obvious aftermath of colonial oppression is the all-round, mainly social and economic, backwardness of nascent states. It is precisely backwardness and not poverty, since most of these states have no less manpower and natural resources than many economically advanced countries, and their area and populations are roughly the same, too.

The question of who is to blame for this great backwardness is disputed only by champions of colonialism. But history shows it clearly enough that in the pre-colonial period many non-European nations had reached a high level of development. For instance, before the start of the 19th century North Africa and Europe differed little in terms of economic development. On the whole, according



to US economist Simon Kuznetz, the difference between the countries now regarded as developing and the advanced capitalist states in per capita income was only 1 to 1.5 in the early 19th century.

The colonialists deliberately slowed down economic progress in vast areas of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania or set limits to it to meet their own ends, restricting agriculture to monocultural production and developing mining for the most part.

As a result, the economic gap between the colonized territories and advanced countries, which at the time the Europeans seized them was insignificantly small, greatly widened and kept increasing when these territories freed themselves from colonialism. By the mid-1970s, according to UNCTAD, the per capita income in developing countries already was 12 to 13 times below that of advanced countries and the difference keeps growing.

Social and economic backwardness is compounded by yet another obvious vestige of colonialism—the economic dependence of the young states. Backwardness and dependence are in fact the two sides of the same coin. In the past few decades it became clear that even after they free themselves from colonial regimes, the developing nations cannot get rid of the old international economic order in which the division of labour was effected on the “metropolis-colony” principle. As they found themselves involved by colonialism in the world capitalist economy, former colonies and semi-colonies remained its subjugated, backward and dependent backyard.

Every non-aligned conference pointed out that the existing system of international economic relations was unjust. The Havana Conference noted, in particular, “the persisting inequity in international economic relations, characterized by dependency, exploitation and inequality”.<sup>4</sup>

As a result, there is perhaps no young state today which could regard itself fully independent of, and equal with, the former colonial powers and other Western countries. Economic dependence is the sad plight even of Latin American states, which are more than 150 years old and have reached, on the whole, a high level of development,

but have been dominated by their northern neighbour—the United States—and of the young oil-producing countries, though they themselves have become “bankers”. The neocolonialists cannot disguise this dependence, no matter how hard they try, by phrases about an economic interdependence of all countries in the world today.

The interdependence of the economies of individual countries on the world plane, above all between newly-free states and advanced capitalist countries, is a fact admitted by the non-aligned movement. But this admission is a far cry from the assertions circulated in the West that interdependence is equal “partnership”. The Delhi Summit Conference stated in the Economic Declaration: “Interdependence is asymmetrical as a result of the present iniquitous economic system... As the international economic system has become more interdependent, this interdependence has become still more asymmetrical.”<sup>5</sup> The asymmetry is developing not in favour of the newly-free states, of course. And it is they which remain dependent.

The economic dependence of former colonies and semi-colonies is seen in their continued exploitation by the imperialist powers and monopolies and in the dominance of Western monopoly capital in world trade, price formation, the transport and delivery network, and the currency and crediting systems. It is seen also in their lopsided economies, maimed in the colonial past, and in the status of “client” which is inevitably preserved in their relations with the West; and in their reliance on Western “aid” and the import of not only manufactured goods but also staple foodstuffs from the West. Closed trade and currency zones, established by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), are preserved, with young states still having no equal say in decision-making.

Constant debts to the West are a scourge for the young states. Dependent, exploited and unequal in the world capitalist economic system, they suffer from its ills more than other countries. They are hit the hardest by the crises erupting in the capitalist world.

The newly-free countries’ dependence in the informa-

tion sphere is closely associated with their economic dependence. The point is that "information imperialism" practiced by the Western powers did not cease to exist after the colonial empires collapsed. The old "information order" is still preserved in the relations between the newly-free states and the West, while the national mass media of these states are poorly developed. "Dependence in mass media, just as political and economic dependence, is a legacy of the colonial epoch," said the Charter of the Pool of News Agencies of Non-Aligned Countries adopted in 1976.

It is becoming increasingly obvious that because of the persistent backwardness and dependence of the newly-free states the exploitation of the former colonial domains was not completely eliminated together with the colonial empires and regimes but was even stepped up. Within merely thirty years after the downfall of these empires and regimes the industrialized capitalist countries have extorted from the developing countries more real values than the former colonial powers squeezed from their colonies in the preceding 300 years. Every year, the transnational corporations extract from these countries over \$100,000 million of net profit, which exceeds by a broad margin Western "aid" and investments. So who helps whom after all?

"The wealth is still concentrated in the hands of a few powers whose wasteful economies are maintained by the exploitation of the labour as well as the transfer and plunder of the material and other resources of peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America and other regions of the world,"<sup>6</sup> said the Political Declaration of the 1979 Havana summit. There is no need to explain what "few powers" were meant there. Among the imperialist spoilers the United States and its monopolies are growing more and more rapacious.

The newly-free states' economic dependence is a clear indication that vestiges of colonialism still persist in international political and legal relations.

As regards these relations, the liberation movement has achieved far greater progress and the young states have, on the whole, made a big stride forward along the path of

self-determination, independence and equality. This is seen at every session of the UN General Assembly and in the political activities of the non-aligned movement, the Organization of African Unity and other associations of Asian, African and Latin American countries, which develop independently of the imperialist powers and work against their hegemony. During the independent years many of the newly-free states have ridded themselves of the military presence of the former colonialists and of unequal treaties with them. At the 1978 international diplomatic conference in Vienna the developing countries, backed up by the socialist community, secured legal formalization of the principle freeing them from the observance of the treaties signed in the past by the former colonial powers on behalf of their colonies. A convention on the succession of states in respect of treaties, which was drawn up at the conference and included this principle, marked the young states' legal rupture with the past against the wish of the former colonial powers: none of the latter signed the convention.

However, the blemishes of colonialism in this sphere have not yet been completely wiped off.

The former colonialists still have various air-force, naval and army units and bases in many non-aligned states which are allegedly meant for defending universal peace and security, but which in actual fact are a source of constant threat to world peace and to the neighbouring states. The USA has such bases in Cuba, Panama and many other newly-free states, while Britain has them on Cyprus, and France in Djibouti, Senegal and some other African states. These old bases remain in fact bridgeheads for imperialist interference in the affairs of the above-mentioned and other newly-free states, even if the status of these bases has somewhat changed. Cyprus and Djibouti even find themselves in a far worse position as compared with the colonial past, because now these bases are used jointly with the most aggressive imperialist power—the United States.

Many African and other newly-free states are still bound with former colonial powers by inequitable bilateral treaties imposed on them when independence

was granted to them. Some of these states, as, for instance, Senegal, Gabon and Kenya, still have military agreements with former colonial powers. In independent and non-aligned Oman the British still occupied the highest commanding posts of the three arms of the service in 1985.

The Commonwealth of Nations still exists in the framework of the former British Empire, the multilateral relations in the framework of the former French empire have their own organizational forms, and Latin American countries are still members, together with the USA, of a military bloc known as the 1947 Treaty of Rio de Janeiro and the Organization of American States. Though the mechanism of these multilateral relations of the developing countries has been modernized to some extent, they remain in a largely unequal position.

This is a far from complete list of the consequences of the colonial past in the present economic and political relations of newly-free states with former colonial and other imperialist powers. They are a heavy brake on these states' advancement from the past and into the future, from a subjugated position to full independence and equality in the world.

Colonialism has left similarly ugly traces in the relations among the newly-free countries themselves. The colonialists tried to prevent a wide spread of political, trade and cultural ties among their colonies and semi-colonies (this is precisely one of the reasons why these ties among the newly-free countries today are absent or extremely inadequate). Furthermore, by pursuing a "divide and rule" policy they sowed the seeds of strife which now sprout in various regions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, confirming the conclusion made way back in 1964 at the Cairo Conference of non-aligned countries: "Imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism constitute a basic source of international tension and conflict".<sup>7</sup>

Territorial and border disputes among states in these regions are, as a rule, the result of the arbitrary redivision of the world in the past. The straight border lines among states in free Africa are evidence of the forceful and painful division of their peoples in two or three parts, which was done in the colonial past.

Grave international conflicts erupt sometimes among newly-free states due to ethnic and religious strife among the peoples living within the borders of these states. This is a complex phenomenon, but one of its main causes most certainly is that the colonialists, acting on the "divide and rule" principle, used to encourage strife, and during the administrative redivision of territory they always ignored ethnic and other factors.

And, finally, there is the question of recurrences of colonialism in the foreign policies of the imperialist powers. Or perhaps this is all journalistic phraseology?

No, it is not, which is clear if one considers what has been said earlier in this book about the remaining elements of the old colonial system of oppression. Relapses of traditional colonialism do occur, since conditions for this still exist on a rather broad scale. And what we now call "neocolonialism" is, above all, a direct outcome, a continuation of classical colonialism. What is more, at closer examination neocolonialism in many of its forms turns out to be just a recurrence of colonialism, while neocolonialists are international recidivists doing what they have always done, that is, plundering and subjugating the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania.

Recent decades have shown that the policy of former colonial and other imperialist powers towards newly-free states is still based on the refusal to recognize the movement of the peoples for national, economic and social liberation as a law-governed process in history. Those powers regard the movement merely as a sign of instability, as a series of insurgencies, rebellions and acts of sabotage committed by individual groupings guided by someone from outside. Hence the concept of the arc of instability designed by Zbigniew Brzezinski, vicious propaganda allegations of a "hand of Moscow", a "Soviet military threat" and "Cuba's interference", and portrayal of the leaders and fighters of popular revolutionary organizations as "terrorists". This is also the reason why the young states are still dealt with from the old position of superiority and strength, even though the diplomatic protocol is formally observed.

There still is a good deal of proprietary attitude among

the imperialist powers and monopolies towards former colonies and semi-colonies. The capitalist West looks upon the newly-free countries as its domain, a zone of its vital interests, and not only social and economic but also political interests. This accounts for its overt and covert resistance to a free choice by the peoples of these countries of a path of development and a political course. This also explains why the imperialists still think in the old colonialist categories of "spheres of influence" in the world and seek to retain control over the international relations of newly-free states.

Noting this, the Havana Conference stated that "the policy of dividing the world into spheres of influence—which has been used for centuries by the colonial powers and has caused so much damage to mankind—was still being pursued by some powers to try to frustrate the true independence of countries, particularly of the recently emancipated countries, and to foster relations of subordination and dependency; to exploit the natural resources of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America; and to frustrate final victory of the national liberation movements."

But what are these "some powers" condemned in the joint decisions passed by almost 100 non-aligned countries? The answer is not far to seek. By their actions in the national liberation zone the imperialist powers and monopolies expose themselves and their policy as a recurrence of colonialism, the USA with its imperial ambitions being the most cynical of them all.

A major relapse of colonialism in the policy pursued by the USA and other imperialist powers is, undoubtedly, the continuation of "gunboat diplomacy", so typical of ex-colonialists, in relations with the newly-free states, that is, a threat or use of force by conducting open or slightly disguised punitive expeditions. Here are but a few examples of the grimmest years of colonial brigandage:

1950-53—US aggression in Korea;

1954—armed intervention in Guatemala;

1956—aggression of Great Britain, France and Israel against Egypt;

1958—intervention by the USA and Great Britain in Jordan and Lebanon;

1960-62 and 1964—intervention by Belgium, the USA  
 and other NATO countries in the Congo (Zaire);  
 1965—US intervention in the Dominican Republic;  
 1964-75—US aggression against Vietnam;  
 1969-75—US aggression against Cambodia and Laos;  
 1978—the landing of French and Belgian troops in Shaba  
 Province (Zaire);  
 1979—French intervention in the Central African Re-  
 public;  
 1982—Britain at war with Argentina over the Falkland  
 Islands (Malvinas);  
 1983—US intervention in Grenada.

Apart from these military operations conducted by the  
 above-mentioned powers themselves, the neocolonialists  
 on several occasions used others to pull their chestnuts  
 out of the fire: the intervention of Cuban counter-revolu-  
 tionaries in the Bay of Pigs (Cuba) with direct US sup-  
 port (1961); Israel's aggression, with the support of the  
 USA and other NATO countries, against Egypt, Syria,  
 Jordan and Lebanon (1967); the intrusion of Portuguese  
 mercenaries in Guinea (1970); the aggression of South  
 Africa against Angola (1975-76 and 1981) and against  
 Mozambique (1981); and Israel's aggression against Le-  
 banon (1982), to mention a few. The series of attacks by  
 Israel on Lebanon, and by South Africa on Angola, Mo-  
 zambique, Zambia, Botswana, and by groups of imperial-  
 ist mercenaries on other newly-free countries (Benin,  
 the Comoros, the Seychelles and others) is still going on.

The conclusion drawn by the 1973 non-aligned confer-  
 ence in Alger that "the Third World still remains the are-  
 na of colonial wars and imperialist "intrigues"<sup>8</sup> has lost  
 none of its relevance. And despite the assertions by Amer-  
 ican and other statesmen of the West that they pursue  
 an entirely "new policy of partnership" with regard to  
 developing countries, the colonialist spirit of domination  
 still prevails in it.

\* \* \*

It would clearly be an overstatement to say that the  
 governments of all non-aligned countries without excep-  
 tion fully recognize that the colonialists and neocoloni-



alists are responsible for the present social and economic backwardness of newly-free states. Some of them would like to convince their countrymen that colonialism was a thing of the past and the proclamation of political independence has opened a new chapter in the relations of former colonies and semi-colonies with the former colonial and other imperialist powers. However, the old truth is confirmed: he who forgets the past will meet it again.

The grave consequences of the two, three or five centuries of colonialism and its relapses in the present-day policy of imperialist states cannot be done away with by consoling words. Reality speaks for itself, whether it is recognized or not. And it is reality that gives rise to common international interests among diverse non-aligned and other developing countries.

It is appropriate to recall in this context the courageous assessment of the situation given by Fidel Castro in the preamble to his report at the Delhi summit in 1983: "In the underdeveloped countries, we particularly have in common our national economic interests; the overwhelming problems of accumulated poverty and backwardness; an immense external debt that the vast majority cannot pay." He said also that the developing countries were affected by the increasingly unfair and inequitable terms of international trade, by a horrible threat of nuclear war hanging over all peoples, by "the dreadful exploitation that weighs on our nations", and "the horrendous historical heritage of centuries of colonialist and neo-colonialist plunder in each of our countries".<sup>9</sup> What he said fully applied to the non-aligned nations which make up the overwhelming majority among the developing countries.

## ***Chapter Two. Non-Aligned Movement: Goals, Principles and Positions***

The unity of the world historical process is manifest today more than ever before. The non-aligned movement has from the outset occupied a notable place in this process. This movement is a logical outcome of the

national liberation revolution carried out by the majority of the world population. It is closely linked with the radical social changes going on in the world. Viewed in historical and geographic terms, the tasks confronting the movement affect, one way or another, the interests of all the other nations, and the accomplishment of these tasks inevitably affects world politics and economy. Therefore the significance of the activity of the international association of non-aligned states cannot but transcend the bounds of the territory it occupies in the world.

### 1. General Goals and Principles of Non-Alignment

The goals of the non-aligned movement were named in the policy-making documents of the Belgrade Conference, and were further specified at the subsequent non-aligned conferences. The numerous *goals* of the movement, registered in the documents of its summit forums, can be subdivided into three main interconnected groups.

The first group expresses the common striving for the complete liquidation of the colonial system everywhere and for the national liberation and independent development of nations. The proclaimed goals of the non-aligned movement are to wipe off imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, apartheid and racism, including Zionism, to end domination and hegemony in any form, and to consolidate independence and prevent outside interference in the internal and external affairs of non-aligned countries. "The Non-Aligned Movement," says the Political Declaration of the Delhi summit (March 1983), "was the inevitable result of the felt need of newly independent countries in all parts of the world to protect and strengthen their national independence. These countries saw in non-alignment a decisive instrument for exercising their full sovereignty in political and economic matters."<sup>10</sup>

The second group reflects the wish of the newly-free states to secure peaceful conditions for development and to prevent a world war. They work to ensure world peace

and security, to end the arms race, the nuclear arms race above all, and to achieve general and complete disarmament under international supervision, disbandment of the blocs and military alliances of the great powers, withdrawal of foreign troops and dismantling of foreign military bases. The Political Declaration of the Delhi Conference said: "It is increasingly clear that in the present-day world there is no alternative to a policy of peaceful co-existence, detente and co-operation among States, irrespective of their economic and social systems, size and geographical location."<sup>11</sup>

The third group reflects the striving of the non-aligned countries for full equality in the world. Accordingly, the goals of the non-aligned movement are: democratization of international relations, equal participation of all countries in solving international problems, and the earliest establishment of a new international economic order on a fair and democratic basis. "International relations have entered a phase where decision-making on issues of vital concern to all countries of the world can no longer be the prerogative of a small group of countries, however powerful they may be. The democratization of international relations is an imperative necessity of our times."<sup>12</sup>

The non-aligned countries understand, of course, that their association is to help spread the policy of non-alignment and strengthen political solidarity and economic cooperation among themselves. But the development of the non-aligned movement is not an end in itself to them. They regard it more as an instrument of attaining their main, broader goals. "The strengthening of non-alignment as a broad international movement constitutes an integral part of the profound changes in the structure of the contemporary international relations," says the 1983 Delhi Political Declaration.<sup>13</sup>

In this process the priorities in setting the common goals of the movement change as the conditions change. For instance, as colonial and semi-colonial regimes were liquidated in Asia and in the overwhelming majority of African states, the magnitude of the task of political decolonization inevitably decreased. The wiping out of the seats of colonialism and racism, which used to be a top

priority, now concerns only the countries in the south of Africa and some insular and other territories, though it has lost none of its urgency. Now a goal common to all young states has come to the fore—jointly to ensure their development and full independence. The attainment of this goal is now associated more than ever with ensuring peace and security.

For this reason the 1976 Conference in Colombo said in its Political Declaration that the true independence of states and peaceful coexistence were the main objectives of non-alignment. And in the efforts to achieve full independence special stress is on ensuring jointly an all-round development of non-aligned states, their economic growth in the first place.

It is symptomatic that the view held initially by many non-aligned countries that economic and political tasks were to be approached separately has been gradually overcome. That view was justly regarded by the Colombo Conference as "part of an imperialist strategy" aimed at preserving the old international order. It is incontestable, the Conference stressed, that there is an integral connection between politics and economics, and it is erroneous to approach economic affairs in isolation from politics. It is appropriate for the non-aligned countries to be concerned with the political as well as economic aspects of international affairs. The importance given to economic affairs does not diminish the importance attached to political matters at non-aligned meetings.

But precisely what political problems are primarily associated with economic ones, and what are the main objectives of the non-aligned movement in this context?

Not examining this matter in detail for the time being, it would be enough to single out the main guidelines on the two interconnected main directions of activity formulated at non-aligned meetings, namely, the completion of all-round decolonization and consolidation of conditions for peaceful coexistence. In both directions there arise a large number of more specific tasks to be accomplished. The following decisions by non-aligned meetings will show just how profoundly and seriously these directions and their interrelationship are approached.

Already at the Cairo Conference in 1964 the heads of state or government of non-aligned countries expressed conviction that "peaceful co-existence cannot be fully achieved throughout the world without the abolition of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism".<sup>14</sup> True, indeed. Imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism were rightly regarded as interdependent phenomena of history: wherever one of them is present, the others are surely there too.

The 1976 Colombo Conference, taking up this thought, put it all straight: "Although colonialism, as traditionally understood, is coming to an end, the problem of imperialism continues and can be expected to continue for the foreseeable future... The Non-Aligned have to be alert against all forms of unequal relations and domination that constitute imperialism... The Conference asserted that as long as the slightest vestige of colonialism remained there should be unremitting vigilance."<sup>15</sup> The Delhi Conference, moreover, stressed that "peace and development are interrelated".<sup>16</sup>

So, at present the non-aligned movement has three top priorities—peace, development and equality. They include, in fact, also other goals urgent today, such as the elimination of the remaining seats of colonialism and racism, self-determination of peoples, and the strengthening of the independence of young states, which are unthinkable without equality in international relations. Therefore the non-aligned movement made common cause with "an intensification of the struggle of the peoples of the world for their political and economic independence and for peace and progress, and for an international political and economic order based on the principles of self-determination, justice, equality and peaceful coexistence between peoples and nations of the world"<sup>17</sup>.

As any other international association, the non-aligned movement can exist and effectively attain its goals only if there are firmly established principles underlying its activity. Like its interests and goals, its principles, too, are a uniting factor.

It is precisely in principles, by which non-aligned countries should be guided in determining a common stand on

international issues and in their relations with each other and with other countries, that the political world outlook of non-aligned countries is expressed. They are "linked together by a shared world wisdom and perspective that transcend the differences in their social and economic systems," stressed the Delhi Conference in its Political Declaration.<sup>18</sup>

The *principles* of the movement were elaborated simultaneously and fully in accordance with its goals. The 1964 Cairo Conference called them "fundamental principles of peaceful co-existence". Later they were often set forth and specified in the documents of other summit forums of the movement. Just like the goals, they are numerous and diverse. The following can be singled out among them:

First, the principle of non-alignment, independence from the great powers and blocs, freedom of all states in choosing their social, political and economic systems, and permanent sovereignty over their natural resources.

Second, the principle of the sovereign equality of all countries, "the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, apartheid, racism, including Zionism, and all forms of foreign aggression, occupation, domination, interference or hegemony";<sup>19</sup> and constant support for national liberation movements, for the right of nations to self-determination.

And third, the principle of active peaceful coexistence of all states, whatever their size and social system, and the principle of the non-use of force, of a peaceful settlement of disputes, and of non-intervention and non-interference in the domestic and external affairs of states.

It is important to stress here that the Political Declaration of the 1983 Delhi Conference confirmed "the principled commitment of non-aligned countries not be parties to, or to take any action which would facilitate, great power confrontation and rivalry or strengthen existing military alliances and interlocking arrangements arising therefrom". In particular, the non-aligned countries again pledged themselves not to participate in military arrangements and not to provide military bases and facilities for great power military presence "conceived in the con-

text of great power conflicts". The Delhi summit warned that "the violation of these principles by any country is unjustifiable under any circumstances and is totally unacceptable".<sup>20</sup>

This confirmation of the initial principle of non-alignment with blocs is a most important political characteristic of the association of non-aligned countries. Viewed in the context of the goals and principles listed here, this is just one aspect in the historical development of the movement, and its refraining from assuming any active commitments in military alliances with the great powers does not in the least mean keeping aloof from all international affairs. On the contrary, the goals and principles of the non-aligned movement taken together imply its universal activity in international affairs. They are in fact consonant with the striving of all nations for peace, equality and progress.

When assessing the political thrust and goals and principles of the non-aligned movement, one is to remember that they have always been adopted by consensus, which still allows for variations in their interpretation by individual member states. Therefore it is perhaps the actions of the movement to put into effect its goals and principles that will tell more about the movement than the proclaimed goals and principles themselves. And these actions stem from the movement's basic positions on major international issues. Although they, too, are adopted by consensus and do not mean absolute unanimity among the member countries, the degree of unity on specific issues can be judged precisely by them. It is the political positions of the non-aligned movement and what its members do in practice that are the best criteria of the effectiveness of its goals and principles.

## **2. Non-Aligned Positions on Major International Issues**

Even a comparatively large book cannot offer a detailed analysis of all the decisions made by the movement, not to mention subtle chronological changes in the decisions of its regular meetings on a multitude of specific

questions. This task can be accomplished by authors of voluminous studies, which would be of great interest to science and useful for world politics. The history of the movement and the wide range of its activities provide ample material for the accomplishment of this task. The task, no doubt, can be undertaken by a large research institute.

Therefore I think it would be wise to concentrate on the main areas of the movement's activities, on its fundamental approach to major international issues of our time. It should be remembered, though, that any position of the movement is a compromise, rejecting the extreme points of view, either right or left. This is the only way that more or less generally acceptable decisions are drawn up at NAM forums and a sufficient degree of unity is reached among its member countries. And these are the decisions by which one can judge unmistakably the political direction of the movement as a whole, which does not depend on the wishes of its individual members.

The common political positions which unite the numerous member states of the movement include, above all, active defence of peace, the efforts to promote international security and peaceful coexistence, and prevent nuclear war. This is the stance the non-aligned movement has been consistently adhering to ever since its origin. It is a feature of the policy of non-alignment and of all meetings of non-aligned countries. And, despite the profound concern over the course of events and the arms race, historical optimism is always present in their decisions. They believe it is possible to ensure a lasting and just peace and firmly reject the idea that confrontation can be the only course for the comity of nations.

Already in their first declaration issued at the Belgrade Conference in 1961, its participants said they did not consider the existence of different social systems an insurmountable obstacle for the stabilization of peace. They resolutely rejected the view that war, including the cold war, was inevitable, as that view reflected helplessness and hopelessness and was contrary to world progress. At that time some states held the opposite view, and the Bel-



grade Declaration unambiguously urged them to step up the peace effort.

Some time later, the non-aligned movement again declared that "world conflict is not inevitable" (Colombo, 1976), denounced the concept of "limited nuclear war", "nuclear deterrence" and similar dangerous theories circulated by the Pentagon. It has worked persistently to avert nuclear war and secure a prohibition of all nuclear tests, including in the southern Pacific, and the destruction of all the existing stockpiles of nuclear arms.

All non-aligned meetings have attached great importance to ending the arms race, achieving general and complete disarmament under strict international control and creating peace and nuclear-free zones, including in the Indian Ocean, and proposed a convocation of a world disarmament conference to be attended by all states with a view to setting in motion the process of general disarmament. Already at the First Conference in Belgrade the non-aligned countries declared disarmament to be "an imperative need and the most urgent task of mankind"<sup>21</sup> and specified what they meant by general and complete disarmament. They meant elimination of the armed forces, armaments, foreign bases, arms manufacturing facilities, total prohibition of the manufacture, possession and use of thermonuclear, bacteriological and chemical weapons, and liquidation of launchers designed for mass destruction weapons.

The non-aligned countries declared, for their part, in the Programme for Peace and International Cooperation adopted at the 1964 Cairo Conference their readiness not to produce, acquire or test any nuclear weapons and to take necessary steps to prevent their territories, ports and airfields from being used by nuclear powers for the deployment and storage of nuclear weapons.

At their conferences in Belgrade and Cairo the non-aligned countries for the first time called on all states to use outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes and to establish international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

They also announced their stand in regard to foreign military bases and voiced unlimited support for those

countries, Cuba in particular, which endeavoured to secure the vacation of these bases. It was declared that the establishment and maintenance of foreign military bases, particularly against the express will of states, was a gross violation of their sovereignty. Later the non-aligned movement reiterated this view, demanding the dismantling of military bases on the territory of non-aligned countries. This demand was clearly anti-imperialist from the start, for it was addressed, in fact, only to the United States and the other NATO countries having such bases.

The Cairo Conference in 1964 demanded, in particular, that British bases be dismantled in Aden and on Cyprus and that Washington should evacuate its base at Guantanamo in the Republic of Cuba. The conference also condemned the intention of imperialist powers to establish military bases in the Indian Ocean as a calculated attempt to intimidate the emergent states of Africa and Asia and an unwarranted extension of the policy of neo-colonialism and imperialism. The subsequent non-aligned conferences repeatedly demanded the elimination of US bases from the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean and the Diego Garcia Island in the Indian Ocean. In keeping with its stance on the issue of military bases, the non-aligned movement enthusiastically backed up in 1979 the successful struggle of Panama for regaining sovereignty over the Canal Zone from the United States, and of Malta for eliminating foreign military bases on its territory.

The fundamental attitude of the non-aligned movement to international disputes and conflicts is that they should be settled in a peaceful way. "States must abstain from all use or threat of force directed against the territorial integrity and political independence of other States," said the Programme for Peace and International Cooperation adopted at the 1964 Cairo Conference. "A situation brought about by the threat or use of force shall not be recognized, and in particular the established frontiers of States shall be inviolable... All international conflicts must be settled by peaceful means..."<sup>22</sup> Later the non-aligned meetings reaffirmed this view.

The non-aligned movement has invariably adhered to this view in determining its attitude to the East-West confrontation, regarding this confrontation to be most dangerous for world peace. Paramount significance is attached to this view also in matters of preventing or settling armed conflicts between non-aligned countries, on which their unity and solidarity largely depend.

In keeping with the decisions of the summit meetings of the non-aligned movement, its member countries should be guided by the following principles in these matters: strict mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of non-aligned countries, inviolability of their legitimate frontiers, non-interference, and respect for the right of the peoples to free national and social development; settlement of all conflicts in the framework of regional organizations, such as the OAU, for instance, only by peaceful means through direct negotiations, mediation or good services approved by the parties concerned, or by other means provided for in the UN Charter, without pressure, without the use or threat of force and without foreign interference or intervention. The Delhi Summit Conference (1983) confirmed these principles.

Special emphasis is given to border disputes between neighbouring non-aligned countries. Though it has been commonly recognized that the former colonial and semi-colonial domains of European powers in Asia, Africa and Latin America were often delimited arbitrarily, without taking due account of historical, geographic, ethnic, religious and other factors, the newly-free states, in order to preserve peace and goodneighbourly relations among themselves, "pledge themselves to respect frontiers as they existed when the States gained independence".<sup>23</sup> This decision was adopted, following the example of the Organization of African Unity, by all non-aligned countries already at their Second Summit Conference (Cairo, 1964), which stressed the need to settle disputes among neighbouring countries solely by peaceful means, in the spirit of mutual understanding. The non-aligned movement has come out also for a peaceful solution to the problem of divided countries and for the

self-determination of the peoples of Western Sahara and Eastern Timor.

However, there exist also other approaches within the non-aligned movement to various kinds of conflict. Having recognized at the Cairo Conference that "imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism constitute a basic source of international tension and conflict", the non-aligned movement could not, naturally, guide the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America only towards a peaceful compromise in settling their relations with the West which was using force against them. The Cairo Conference stated in its final document that "the forces of imperialism are still powerful" and that "they do not hesitate to resort to the use of force to defend their interests and maintain their privileges". "This policy," the document went on, "if not firmly resisted by the forces of freedom and peace, is likely to jeopardize the improvement in the international situation and the lessening of tension which has occurred, and to constitute a threat to world peace."

This accounts for the wide support rendered by the non-aligned movement to the armed struggle waged by the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America for liberation from colonial and racist oppression, and to the resolute resistance put up by the newly-free countries to the aggressive actions by the USA, Israel and South Africa. The first relevant statement by the non-aligned on this issue in 1964 was that of principle. The Cairo Conference clearly formulated the movement's position: "Colonized peoples may legitimately resort to arms to secure the full exercise of their right to self-determination and independence if the colonial powers persist in opposing their natural aspirations".<sup>24</sup> The 1979 Havana Conference reaffirmed the legitimate right of peoples to use armed struggle in their fight for national liberation.

Thus, it is quite admissible to use in conflicts with colonialists non-peaceful means of struggle as the surest way to forcing them to end such conflicts through negotiations. This position was expressed in the movement's vigorous support for the struggle of the peoples of Algeria, Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau, Nami-

bia, and the Arab people of Palestine.

The NAM adheres to this position also with regard to conflicts caused by the aggressive actions of the forces of imperialism, neocolonialism and racism against newly-free states. It has invariably sided with the people of Vietnam and other countries of Indochina who fought against the US aggressors and the non-aligned Arab countries which became victims of Israeli aggression, and supported the peoples of Angola, Mozambique, Zambia and Botswana in their fight against the South Africa aggressors.

The non-aligned summits always urge the member states to act more resolutely. The 1973 Conference in Alger, for instance, stressed in its Political Declaration the need "to find a rapid solution to the conflicts taking place in the third world, where imperialist and colonialist power politics clash with the legitimate aspirations of the people".<sup>25</sup>

Of fundamental significance in this context is the call of the conference for "cooperation of non-aligned countries with all countries which oppose colonialism and neo-colonialism, for the purpose of lending an active support to the armed struggle of African liberation movements".<sup>26</sup> The 1976 Colombo Conference called upon all countries "to give all-out support and military, moral and material assistance to the Arab States and the Palestinian people under the leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization, in the struggle to end the Israeli aggression".<sup>27</sup> The 1979 Havana Conference emphasized that all-round, including military, assistance should be given to the Frontline States in the south of Africa for "strengthening and increasing their capabilities to withstand aggression against them by the racist regimes".<sup>28</sup> The Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries readily answered these calls.

The position of the non-aligned movement on questions of struggle for peace and freedom shows a desire to cooperate with all peace- and freedom-loving forces. The 1979 Havana summit welcomed in its Political Declaration "cooperation received by non-aligned countries from other peace, freedom and justice loving, democratic and

progressive States and forces in the achievement of their goals and objectives".<sup>29</sup> It reaffirmed the movement's course towards cooperating with them on the basis of equality. The Havana and other non-aligned summit forums repeatedly recognized the role of the socialist states in supporting the struggle against colonialist and racist régimes in the south of Africa and in rebuffing their acts of aggression.

Judging by the decisions taken by the non-aligned movement, its member countries are convinced that peace is not only a matter of security. In their common opinion peace and disarmament are closely associated with completing the decolonization of developing countries and their international relations, since the remaining backwardness and dependence of the emergent states, as well as other vestiges of the colonial past, impede the consolidation of the peaceful coexistence principles. This position has been most vividly manifest in the movement's attitude to detente of the 1970s.

The non-aligned movement welcomed the signing of the Soviet-American SALT 2 treaty and the relaxation of European tensions as recorded in the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe signed in Helsinki in 1975. However, the movement's stance on this matter was not confined merely to a positive response to the improvement of East-West relations. It was not a position of a detached onlooker.

The Alger non-aligned conference declared already in 1973 that "the efforts at conciliation and cooperation springing up in certain parts of the world will remain of limited effect, and will not be able to respond to the popular desire for freedom, security, and peace, as long as such efforts involve appeasement with those who would maintain colonialism, racism, exploitation, and foreign aggression in other parts of the world."<sup>30</sup> The conference put it straight that detente should not mean the acceptance of the conditions of oppression in Africa, Asia, or Latin America, nor the transmission of tension from the European continent to the countries of the Third World. While colonialism still continues to exist in any form, non-aligned countries and liberation movements will have the

obligation to defend freedom.

The Colombo Conference in 1976 arrived at the conclusion that detente was still limited in scope and geographical extent, that tensions and conflicts existed in other areas and that aggression, foreign occupation, intervention and interference and racial discrimination, Zionism and apartheid, as well as economic exploitation, continued unabated in various parts of the developing world.

That conclusion obviously pertained only to the Western powers practicing aggression, intervention, discrimination, and exploitation in the developing world. The improvement of the situation and relaxation of tensions in their relations with newly-free states depended precisely on those powers. Therefore it was to them, above all, that the conference addressed its call "for the global relaxation of international tension". This was made perfectly clear as the conference documents stated that "the underlying cause of international tensions ... was attributable mainly to the forces of imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, Zionism, racism and other forms of alien domination which endeavour by pressure or threat or use of force to hinder the political and economic emancipation of nations and maintain the existing pattern of unjust and unequal relationships in the international community".<sup>31</sup>

Now we have come to the second main area of activity in which the interests, goals and positions of the non-aligned countries coincide. This was clearly pointed out, in particular, in the documents of the 1973 Conference in Alger: "The conflict with colonialism, neo-colonialism, Zionism, and imperialism remains a significant reality in our epoch, sharply illuminating the indivisibility of the struggles and the common destiny of the peoples of the Third World."<sup>32</sup>

This explains why the non-aligned countries demanded, already at their first summit conferences, "the immediate unconditional, total and final abolition of colonialism and resolved to make a concerted effort to put an end to all types of new colonialism and imperialist domination in all its forms and manifestations" (Belgrade, 1961),<sup>33</sup> and undertook "to work unremittingly to eradicate all vestiges of colonialism" (Cairo, 1964).<sup>34</sup> Thus the path

from the past into the future was charted for the emergent states.

On this path they have to grapple with numerous problems involved in the efforts to completely wipe out all vestiges of colonial oppression and ensure genuine equality and independence of their peoples in the political, social, economic and other spheres. Therefore the non-aligned and other developing countries have found a wide application to the term "decolonization" which only recently was synonymous merely with elimination of colonial regimes. In fact, there is almost no question of the domestic or foreign policy of newly-free states which would not be associated, one way or another, with the need to continue and complete their liberation.

If one regards the development of the newly-free states in the context of decolonization, one will clearly see that most of their efforts to strengthen political and economic independence, overcome backwardness, ensure social progress and a free choice of the path of development, revive national culture, restructure the international economic order, and gain complete equality in the world are still concentrated on overcoming the obstacles remaining after the epoch of colonialism and on removing the aftermath of that epoch. From the "decolonization of the economy" to "decolonization of information" and "spiritual decolonization"—such is the range of the demands advanced by the peoples and governments of the young states and their associations today.

Naturally, the non-aligned movement attaches the greatest importance to economic liberation, without which it is impossible to lay the groundwork for political independence. Non-aligned meetings urge their participants to "use their sovereignty and independence at the political level as a lever for the attainment of their sovereignty and independence at the economic level"<sup>3 5</sup> and stress the vast significance of strengthening political independence through economic liberation. Already the 1970 Lusaka Conference set the task of preventing the emergence of technological colonialism. The 1973 Alger Conference advanced an economic programme pointing out the need to put an end to all forms of foreign domination



and exploitation and "to ensure genuine independence by eliminating foreign monopolies and taking over control of national resources and utilizing them for the benefit of the people".<sup>36</sup> The establishment of sovereignty over natural resources, restructuring of international relations on fair and democratic principles and promotion of economic cooperation among newly-free states—these are the three elements underlying the position of the non-aligned movement on economic decolonization.

But this cannot be achieved by economic struggle alone, as experience has shown. There should be full-scale social decolonization, which is impossible without political struggle. The 1979 Havana Declaration says that "the struggle ... to establish the New International Economic Order is an integral part of the people's struggle for political, economic, cultural and social liberation."<sup>37</sup>

If we try to sum up briefly how much the developing countries have achieved on their way to all-round decolonization, we should note in the first place that due to their efforts the existence of this problem and the need to solve it have been recognized in the world. This has been recognized by the associations of the non-aligned and other developing countries and by the UN. The chief gains were listed in the Lima Declaration issued by the 1975 Conference of Foreign Ministers of Non-Aligned Countries: "The Ministers for Foreign Affairs noted with satisfaction the progress made with respect to the recognition of the sovereign right of States to choose freely their political, economic and social systems, to the application of the principle of permanent sovereignty over natural resources and other economic activities, including nationalization and readjustment of prices to obtain an equitable and remunerative price level for exports of raw materials and other basic commodities and the acceptance by the international community of the need to evolve and implement the New International Economic Order which ensures mutual and equitable benefits for all States."<sup>38</sup>

As regards the new international economic order demanded by the non-aligned movement, its essential elements, according to the Economic Declaration of the

1976 Colombo Conference, should be: a radical restructuring of the entire mechanism of international trade, with the interests of developing countries taken duly into account: a cardinal restructuring of world production on the basis of a new international division of labour and effective control over the activities of transnational corporations in accordance with the advancement goals of the developing countries: a radical revision of existing international currency agreements and the establishment of a new rational, fair and universal monetary system meeting the needs of developing countries as well.

The position of the non-aligned movement with regard to the new international economic order includes also the demand to ensure an appropriate inflow of money into developing countries in a non-discriminatory way, with the principle of independence being observed, and the development of methods to urgently solve the young states' debt problem. The non-aligned movement regards the new international information order, the establishment of which it so persistently demands, as a major component of the new international economic order. The movement insists on the earliest holding of "global talks", under the UN aegis, on all problems involved in restructuring international economic relations. As it was noted at the 1976 Colombo summit, "nothing short of a complete restructuring of the existing international economic relations will provide an enduring solution to the world economic problems, particularly those of the developing countries".<sup>39</sup>

The non-aligned movement regards cooperation of the member countries on principles of "collective self-reliance" in social and economic advancement as a major instrument in the struggle for the new international economic order and against the economic dominance of imperialist powers and transnational corporations. "The principle of self-reliance," said the 1976 non-aligned conference in Colombo, "is not only compatible with the aims of the New International Economic Order but is a highly important factor in the strengthening of the solidarity of non-aligned and other developing countries in their struggle to achieve economic emancipation".<sup>40</sup>

What does this principle mean to the non-aligned countries? The answer is provided by the Economic Declaration of the Colombo Conference: "Self-reliance implies a firm determination on the part of the developing nations to secure their legitimate economic rights in international dealings through the use of their collective bargaining strength... And, most importantly, it means willingness to explore and pursue the immense possibilities of cooperation among themselves in financial, technical, trade, industrial and other fields."<sup>41</sup>

In its self-reliance concept the movement proceeds from the conviction that "the idea that the developing world constitutes only parallel economies is no longer valid, since the developing world reflects a wide variety of resource endowments and stages of development". Indeed, in accordance with the action programmes adopted at their meetings, the non-aligned countries gradually established wide economic ties among themselves, which was formerly obstructed by colonial regimes. They cooperate in trade, financial, raw-material, technological and other fields. Encouraged by the non-aligned movement, cooperation is conducted at interregional, regional and subregional levels, in particular in the framework of the Group of 77, the OAU, OPEC and other associations of raw-material producing countries. The non-aligned nations gradually extend their cooperation also to culture, science, technology, education and public health.

This does not mean rejection of foreign aid, but it is becoming increasingly clear that it can be used only in addition to the national efforts of the newly-free states and their associations, and that it is extremely dangerous for the independence of these states to rely mainly on the assistance of former colonial and other imperialist powers.

However, collective self-reliance does not mean an end to, or reduction of, the legitimate demands addressed to colonialists and neocolonialists. Of special significance in this connection is the question, raised by the non-aligned movement, concerning the right of developing countries to a compensation for the damage caused by colonialists and neocolonialists.

Already at their first summit conference in 1961 the

non-aligned countries proposed a convocation of an international conference to "discuss ... common problems and to reach an agreement on the ways and means of repelling all damage which may hinder their development".<sup>42</sup> Fifteen years later, the fifth non-aligned conference stated in no uncertain terms that the colonialist and neocolonialist powers should fully indemnify them for the losses caused by the use and exhaustion of their natural resources and compensate for the damage inflicted by the actions of colonialists and neocolonialists. It adopted the Resolution on Compensation for the Effects of War.

This important resolution spoke of all colonial wars, wars between colonialists, and acts of aggression launched by imperialist powers, and stressed that "colonialist and Imperialist Powers and their neo-colonialist, racist and Zionist allies should bear the material and human losses which developing countries have suffered and continue to suffer".<sup>43</sup> The above statement is obviously addressed, among others, to South Africa and Israel.

The non-aligned movement specified this position on many occasions. In 1976, for instance, when Israel launched an arbitrary military action at the Entebbe airport in Uganda, where air passengers were held hostage, the Colombo Conference demanded that Israel fully compensate for the material damage suffered by Uganda during the invasion. The 1979 Havana Conference demanded that the United States should make up for Cuba's heavy material losses caused by the US blockade of the Cuban revolution and by "all types of imperialist aggression".<sup>44</sup> Individual non-aligned countries (Cuba, Vietnam, Libya, Angola, etc.) also present their claims to imperialist powers.

The peoples of former colonies and semi-colonies become increasingly aware that their growing financial and economic claims to the West are completely fair. It is significant that the governments of many non-aligned countries look upon aid received from Western powers and monopolies as compensation for the losses caused by the colonialist and neocolonialist exploitation of the natural and other resources of these countries or by acts of aggression against them.

The question of the right of developing countries to a compensation for the damage caused by colonialists and neocolonialists has acquired today not only economic but also political connotation as a major international issue. It has been included in the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1974. However, this major issue, like many other problems related to completing the decolonization of developing countries and their international relations, is still awaiting practical solution.

There is hardly any need to say who blocks the exercise by the non-aligned movement of its just demands for final and all-round decolonization. The Havana Conference noted that much headway had been made towards decolonization, though the colonialist and expansionist powers have never ceased their efforts to undermine the true independence of the new states and impose new forms of subordination and dependency on them. Numerous decisions of non-aligned meetings on specific issues point out clearly enough what powers are meant here.

Thus, the non-aligned movement has come out for the elimination of the racist regime in South Africa and, demanding its international isolation, insisted that any co-operation with it be ended and comprehensive and obligatory sanctions be imposed against it by the UN Security Council. But the USA and other imperialist powers, opposed to eliminating the apartheid regime, torpedoed the Security Council decisions on sanctions against it.

The non-aligned movement renders wide support to the struggle of the Puerto Ricans against US colonialism and demands a return by Britain of the Malvinas (Falkland Islands) under the sovereignty of Argentina, for a return by France of the Mayotte Island under the sovereignty of the Comoros, and yet another four islands under the sovereignty of Madagascar. The USA, Britain and France are all against this.

The non-aligned movement resolutely demands that recurrences of colonialism be ended, the US blockades of Cuba and Nicaragua be stopped together with the US acts of pressure and threats with regard to Cuba, Nicaragua and other non-aligned countries. It is opposed to the grow-

ing US military presence in the Middle East, in the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean. It denounces US policy in the Middle East and demands that the USA should discontinue its support for Israel and its aggression against Arab countries, and has proposed that the UN Security Council should apply sanctions against Israel in keeping with Article VII of the UN Charter. But Washington has invariably ignored the joint decisions of the non-aligned countries.

And, last but not least, it is former colonialist as well as other neocolonialist powers that are to blame for the continuing all-round exploitation of the new states and for the stalemate in the negotiations on restructuring international economic relations. The imperialist powers ignore the non-aligned countries' demands that they should make up for the damage caused to the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America by colonialist exploitation and the acts of aggression committed by neocolonialists. It is not surprising therefore that the Havana Conference, reflecting the movement's anti-imperialist stance on problems of completing decolonization, arrived at the clear-cut conclusion that "international economic relations are still characterized by the fundamental contradiction between the upholders of the *status quo* based on domination, dependency and exploitation, and the common struggle of the non-aligned and other developing countries for their liberation and economic development".<sup>45</sup>

It is not easy, of course, to resolve these contradictions and eliminate the hard legacy of colonialism once and for all. The newly-free states realize full well that it is impossible to overcome economic backwardness and dependency at a stroke. The policy document of the ruling party and government of Zambia, *Humanism in Zambia*, adopted way back in 1967, points out, for instance, that the act of political independence is only the first part of the extremely long process of decolonization. Probably economic independence cannot be achieved within the lifetime of one generation, and in many respects it is even harder than the winning of political independence, the document concluded. Such is a realistic assessment

of the difficulties involved in achieving economic emancipation and social and economic progress. The Havana summit stated in 1979 that in the struggle for emancipation the peoples of non-aligned countries "have advanced along their path ..., but there is still a long way to go".<sup>46</sup>

But the beginning has been made. Opening up new opportunities offered by political independence, the non-aligned and other developing countries have already launched the struggle for their "second liberation". "The process of decolonization is nearing completion," the Colombo Conference declared, "and resistance to unequal relations which could amount to domination is becoming stronger."<sup>47</sup> This is the main thing.

It is obvious that for all its "modernization" and concessions to newly-free states neocolonialism would not surrender and would not give up the advantages it enjoys due to retaining some elements of the old colonial system of oppression and exploitation. No developing country is capable of launching an effective offensive on the inheritors of this system singlehanded. In the exhausting struggle against the vestiges of the colonial past they derive strength, above all, from unity among themselves and from the support rendered by other anti-imperialist forces in the world.

There is every reason to state that the historical process of the completion of decolonization, and achievement of socio-economic progress, together with the struggle for peace and peaceful coexistence, are the main directions of the policy pursued by the non-aligned movement on the world scene. This process goes hand in hand with the unremitting striving of the young states for greater independence and full equality in the world. Precisely here, in this strategic direction, the objective foundation of their anti-imperialism and solidarity with the other anti-imperialist forces is built.

In contrast to the Western powers, the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community support the non-aligned movement, its goals and principles and its anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist positions. Soviet leaders have sent messages of greetings to all non-aligned summit forums and in their statements they have

always regarded the non-aligned movement and its activities as a major positive factor of international affairs.

"The rise of the non-aligned movement and its emergence as an important factor in present-day international relations," said Mikhail Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "are a major achievement of the peoples of the newly-free countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America." The non-aligned movement has always been regarded in the USSR as a champion of the natural desire of the newly-free countries to jointly oppose the forces of imperialism, colonialism, racism and hegemonism, to consolidate their independence and defend freedom, for which their peoples have paid so high a price.

\* \* \*

If the development of international relations depended solely on the non-aligned countries, their common interests, goals, principles and positions would probably be already realized or, at least, be fairly close to realization. But the fact that this is not so at present does not mean that they all remain merely on paper and exert no influence on international affairs. Otherwise it would be impossible to account for the obvious growth in the international prestige of the association of non-aligned countries which we witness today.

Evidently there are several causes of this, a major one being the general recognition of the fact that the non-aligned movement, as is stated in the Political Declaration of its Delhi Conference, "represents a major dynamic force in contemporary history. It has served as a catalyst in the efforts to transform the structure of international relations from that of imperialist subjugation and colonial dominance and exploitation towards an equitable world order based on independence, equality, justice, co-operation and development."<sup>48</sup>

It is clear to any unbiased person that the non-aligned movement is not the only international stimulating force in this direction, that there exists, for instance, such a powerful force as the socialist community. But it is just as obvious that the NAM plays a vigorous role in interna-



tional activities. It was on the insistence of the non-aligned countries that a special session of the UN General Assembly was called in 1974 to adopt the Declaration and Programme of Action on the Establishment of the New International Economic Order. They also played a decisive part in the adoption by the 29th Session of the UN General Assembly that same year of the historic Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which laid the legal groundwork for the new international economic order.

Another main cause of the growing international prestige of the non-aligned movement is that it has been generally recognized as a big anti-war and anti-militaristic force—a positive factor of international relations. The hopes for the prevention of war and for peaceful coexistence are associated to a certain degree with the realization of the principles and goals of the non-aligned movement and with its extensive activity. Its prestige was boosted, among other things, by the fact that the Special Session of the UN General Assembly on Disarmament was convened on its initiative in 1978, and that somewhat earlier it proposed that the Indian Ocean be declared a peace zone.

And, finally, the great international role of the movement is recognized because it is a stable association of small and medium-size countries. The movement's unity makes it a major organized international force. The mere fact that diplomatic and propaganda agencies of all countries have always responded to them, one way or another, is yet another sign of the general recognition of the growing role of the movement in the development of international relations.

Anti-imperialism, peacefulness and unity are the three natural elements which account for the high and well deserved prestige of the movement. Though arithmetic is not entirely appropriate here, the sum total of these items clearly depends on the magnitude of each of them—it also can grow or get smaller. This is manifest most clearly when the international situation is getting worse, and when the unity and the common principles and positions of the non-aligned countries are put to a test of strength.

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 402.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 402.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 434.

<sup>5</sup> UN A/38/132, April 8, 1983, p. 67.  
S/15675

<sup>6</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 402.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>9</sup> Fidel Castro, "The World Economic and Social Crisis: Its Impact on the Underdeveloped Countries, Its Sombre Prospects and the Need to Struggle If We Are to Survive". Report to the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, Havana, 1983, p. 6.

<sup>10</sup> UN A / 38 / 132, April 8, 1983, p. 8.  
S/15675

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 112.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 8.

<sup>14</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 21.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 193.

<sup>16</sup> UN A/38/132, April 8, 1983, p. 64.  
S/15675

<sup>17</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 189.

<sup>18</sup> UN A/38/132, April 8, 1983, p. 8.  
S/15675

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 403.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>21</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 8.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 21.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 96.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 197.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 412.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 404.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 191.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 7.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., p. 209.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., p. 94.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 434.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., pp. 152-153.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 210.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 211.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 8.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 244.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 419.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p. 434.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 402.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 205.

<sup>48</sup> UN A/38/132  
S/15675, April 8, 1983, p. 50.

## **IV**

### **THE MOVEMENT AND POLICY OF NON-ALIGNMENT: A TEST OF STRENGTH**

During the relatively brief span of time since the origin of the non-aligned movement, its main guidelines, principles and positions on international problems have on many occasions undergone severe tests. Any of its forums, especially at the summit and ministerial levels, is a test of unity, while the firmness of the anti-imperialist non-alignment of each NAM member is being tested practically all the time.

The difficult international situation in the late 1970s revealed both the encouraging possibilities for the cause of peace, freedom and progress, and the great dangers on this path.

On the one hand, the spirit of detente was still displayed in the continuing Helsinki process in Europe and in the signing of the Soviet-American strategic arms limitation treaty (SALT 2) in June 1979. The anti-imperialist national liberation movement, too, was gaining strength. Most eventful in this sense was 1979, the year when the anti-American and anti-Shah revolution won in Iran, the reactionary pro-imperialist regimes were toppled in Nicaragua and Grenada, a British military base was evacuated from Malta, the long-awaited treaties between Panama and Washington on the gradual transfer to Panama of administration over the Panama Canal came into force, and the CENTO bloc collapsed.

In that situation the Sixth Non-Aligned Summit Conference in 1979 stated in its Political Declaration: "The aspirations of peoples and countries for full emancipation and real equality in international relations continued to grow and have remained the main feature of our times. There has been a further mounting resistance against all

forms and tendencies of foreign domination, occupation and oppression."<sup>1</sup>

But the period that began at the turn of the 1980s and continues to this day has offered perhaps the severest test for the non-aligned movement as a whole and for each of its member countries. Born amidst the cold war and matured in the 1970s, when the international climate improved, the non-aligned movement again found itself in a very cold spell, especially after January 1981, when the Reagan Administration came to office in the United States. US imperialism again relied on strength, a strategy aimed "at restoring America's leading role in world affairs", as was stated by the US Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger in June 1981. The Pentagon has announced a course to an unrestrained arms race, including in outer space (Reagan's Star Wars), plans to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and develops versions of a "limited" and full-scale nuclear war.

The US Administration does not conceal which of the world forces it regards to be the main hindrance to its great-power ambitions. President Reagan himself announced a "crusade" against world communism and the Soviet Union, and declared his intention to "dismiss it (communism.—*Ed.*) as a sad, bizarre chapter in human history". The aggressiveness of US imperialism with regard to the USSR has sharply increased and become openly provocative. As a result, Soviet-American relations have grown tense, causing the worsening of the international climate as a whole. The threat of a nuclear catastrophe has become real.

In this context the Havana non-aligned summit in 1979 was right when it stated that "the threat to human survival has never been more acute than it is today".<sup>2</sup> The threat of destruction looming over civilization alarmed the non-aligned countries which need stable peace for their development. Addressing the Delhi Summit Conference in 1983, Indira Gandhi declared: "Without peace, my father said, all our dreams of development turn to ashes." These words expressed the opinion of all non-aligned countries and their common assessment of the new situation in the world, which was

extremely dangerous to their future.

But apart from the dangerous building up of East-West tensions, the non-aligned countries at the turn of the 1980s faced the overall stepping up of imperialist counter-offensive against the forces of national liberation and social emancipation, a crisis in the world capitalist economy and a disastrous deterioration of the financial and economic conditions in the developing world. The situation was made still worse by open clashes among non-aligned countries, which brought about crisis developments in the OAU, the League of Arab States (LAS) and OPEC; conflicts around Kampuchea, Afghanistan, Chad, and Western Sahara; and the Iran-Iraq war, the most protracted and sanguinary of all wars ever fought between non-aligned countries. There has also been a rapid social and political differentiation among these countries, their development becoming increasingly uneven; some of them, wishing to become "power centres" in their regions, were joining the arms race.

In these hard conditions the policy of non-alignment and the movement itself have been put to a double test—the test of unity and of anti-imperialism. It would be logical to ask: How has this worsening of the international climate affected the policy and movement of non-alignment? To answer this question, a brief but fairly detailed analysis of this situation would be required.

### ***Chapter One. Non-Alignment at the Time of World Tensions and the Economic Crisis of the 1980s***

The developments in the late 1970s and early 1980s showed clearly enough that the increased aggressiveness of US imperialism, leveled in the final analysis primarily at the USSR and the socialist community as a whole, turned also against the national liberation forces and the developing countries. The "anti-communist crusade" turned out to be also a "crusade" against the political, social and economic emancipation of the countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania.

## **1. The Vital Interests of Non-Aligned Countries Threatened**

As we look into the various causes of the hard problems which confronted the newly-free countries on the eve of the 1980s they all seem to stem from the fact that Washington has declared almost the entire area of national liberation a zone of US "vital interests".

This is obvious from the US aggressive actions in recent years: repeated punitive shelling by American warships of national patriotic forces and air attacks on populated mountain areas in Lebanon (1983), the unprovoked armed intervention in Grenada in October 1983, the mining of Nicaragua's territorial waters in March 1984, and constant threats of aggression against Cuba, Nicaragua and Libya. The undeclared war against Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Nicaragua and Vietnam is still going on. The US Administration actually encourages the repeated aggressive actions by South Africa, which Washington calls its strategic ally, against Angola, Mozambique and other Front-line States of Africa. It also supported the activities of Israel, with which it signed an agreement on strategic cooperation, against Lebanon, against Palestine patriots, against Iraq in 1981, and against Tunisia in October 1985. The actions of Britain, the USA's ally in NATO, to "teach Argentina a lesson" in the conflict over the Malvinas (Falkland Islands) in 1982, in which Washington supported London, and the use of the French armed forces in Chad well accorded with the US reliance on strength. In view of these and other events the Havana non-aligned summit expressed concern over the plans of destabilization and aggression against the states whose positions had an unfavourable effect on the interests and policy of the imperialists.

The formation by the Pentagon of special interventionist units and commands for the Caribbean and the Middle East and the expansion of the network of US military bases in the national liberation zone are all aimed at the use of force against newly-free states under the guise of protecting US "vital interests". The constant

“muscle flexing” by the US naval units in the seas and oceans washing the shores of Asia, Africa and Latin America pursue the same goal.

In 1981, a regional US Caribbean Command was specially formed to combat the national liberation movement in the region. The United States has set up a Rapid Deployment Force (RDF) totalling some 300,000 men, which in January 1983 was given the status of the unified central command (CENTCOM), its geographic zone of responsibility covering 19 countries in the Middle East and North and East Africa. Presidential Directive 138 of April 3, 1984, on the so-called combating of international terrorism (the term which the US Administration applies also to the national liberation movement), provides for the preemptive use of specially trained detachments, including regular troops, against revolutionary movements, and also against countries that support them. In these conditions the warning issued by the Havana Conference that interference into the domestic affairs of states is becoming a main form of aggression against non-aligned countries sounds as an alarm signal.

By the mid-1980s, the preparations for carrying out the US interventionist plans were in full swing. The United States has built up its military presence, in particular in the Indian Ocean, on a permanent basis, thereby blocking the implementation of the non-aligned movement's demand that the ocean be made a peace zone. A network of bases has been set up to provide logistical support for possible operations by the US Rapid Deployment Force, one of the largest of them being on the Diego Garcia Island. Besides, the Americans have secured the right to use some 25 military installations in Africa and the islands near that continent by concluding relevant treaties with Kenya, Somalia and Morocco. They have also acquired access to Pakistani military bases and are already using bases and airfields in Cyprus, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Oman. Moreover, beginning with 1980, the RDF has been regularly conducting Bright Star exercises in Somalia, Oman and Egypt and some other Middle East countries to train for possible operations in desert conditions. Similar exercises of 10,000 US Marines were



held in November 1983 in Honduras close to the Nicaraguan border.

This turn in US policy can bring the newly-free countries nothing but a revival of the worst times of colonial brigandage. It is especially dangerous to the non-aligned countries because the Pentagon clearly intends to use the territory of some non-aligned countries for armed intervention against others, and is already involving some of these countries in fulfilling its plans of protecting US "vital interests" against the forces of national liberation and social emancipation. In October 1983, it all came to a point at which three non-aligned countries—Barbados, St. Lucia and Jamaica—were involved in the US intervention in non-aligned Grenada and then in the occupation of that country. Britain and France pursue much the same line. During the Falkland conflict in 1982, Britain, following the practice of colonial wars, hired detachments of Nepalese Gurkhas and used them against Argentina. For several years now imperialism has been using Pakistan in the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

Over these years the non-aligned countries have faced perhaps still greater dangers in the financial and economic fields. Most of these countries have learnt what it really means to remain exploited and economically dependent in the capitalist world. "Dragged along by the crisis generated in the developed capitalist economies, they—as always—paid the highest price for a situation they had not created, since they were used to soften the crisis' worst effects," said Fidel Castro in his report to the Seventh Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Delhi.<sup>3</sup>

This is borne out by obvious facts. The Delhi Conference stated in its Economic Declaration that, beginning with 1980, the economic growth of 36 least developed countries, 26 of them in Africa, stopped, while a decrease in the gross domestic per capita product was registered in many newly-free states for the first time since World War II. The incomes developing countries receive from the main area of their foreign trade, namely, trade with the West, dropped considerably, because the prices of their

raw materials in real terms were the lowest in the past fifty years, and the access of their manufactured goods to Western markets was limited by the protectionist measures imposed by Western countries, while the prices of imported manufactures soared high.

At the same time, the financial debts of non-aligned and other developing countries on the credits received mainly from the West on rapacious terms have snowballed. Within the mere five years, from 1980 to 1984, the debts shot up 60 per cent to reach the staggering \$1 trillion by late 1985. The epicentre of the debt crisis is now Latin America.

The repayment of debts and big interest on them (by 1985 the sum being repayed exceeded all the 1975 foreign debts of the developing countries five times over, and amounted to nearly \$130,000 million in 1984) is a heavy burden on the economies of young states. In many of them it exceeded the total inflow of money, though even if 20 per cent of export revenues is spent on repayment of foreign debts, the economy of a country begins to crumble, all the more so if the country is hit by severe natural disasters, as was the case in Africa in the first half of the 1980s.

The repayment of interest on the debts of the 1980-84 period increased by 130 per cent, with the total sum for the developing countries being \$235,000 million, which is more than their total debt in 1975. Thus former colonies and semi-colonies actually began to finance the development of the richest imperialist powers and monopolies.

This money goes never to return, bleeding the developing economies white. Moreover, the foreign debts of many developing countries have almost reached the cost of their gross domestic product (Argentina, Peru and other countries), while in some of them, as in Egypt, it even exceeded that cost. This is not very surprising, considering that in the early 1980s the debts of these countries were growing 40 times as fast as their gross domestic product. This debt crisis has put in question the future of the developing countries.

The Delhi non-aligned conference stated in 1983 that

"their past achievements are being undermined and their growth jeopardized".<sup>4</sup> As a result of the immense balance-of-payment deficit and huge debts, the conference said, "almost all of them have had to curtail vital development activities and many of them are on the brink of economic collapse".<sup>5</sup>

It became clear in that period that the hopes of the newly-free countries for a rapid and fair restructuring of international economic relations and for global talks on such restructuring were dashed. All their attempts to have the UN and other agencies discuss these problems thoroughly and prepare their solution came to a deadlock.

At their summit conference in Delhi they had to state that "only some developed countries had adopted a positive attitude in response to the call for the establishment of the New International Economic Order".<sup>6</sup> Among such countries is the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community which have on many occasions, jointly and individually, come out in support of the legitimate demands of the non-aligned and other developing countries. At the same time, the Economic Declaration went on to say, "a few economically powerful countries have impeded progress towards the restructuring of international economic relations".<sup>7</sup> Reference here is to the USA and other imperialist powers, which sabotage UN decisions and the adoption of any effective measures on such a restructuring.

Meanwhile the debt problem in the relations between the developing countries and the imperialist powers has been growing more acute in recent years, which has laid bare the vital need for a radical change in the entire structure of international economic, including monetary, relations provided, naturally, that the interests of all countries are taken into account. Unless this is done, it would be impossible to overcome the heavy consequences of colonialism in the newly-free countries and their economic backwardness.

In recent years imperialism, US imperialism above all, set out to avail itself of the hard financial and economic plight of the developing countries, using it for political diktat. The West began, on a broader scale than ever

before, to use the arm twisting method with regard to these countries, pulling financial and economic levers to influence their policy.

Washington, which acts most cynically, widely applied private business principles in world politics. The Reagan Administration has admitted publicly that it buys UN votes. The act adopted in the USA in 1983, according to which the size of economic aid to a country depends, among other things, on how it votes at the UN, is evidence of this. Under this act, the US Secretary of State should furnish information to Congress on the extent to which each of the 159 UN members backs up the US, mainly in matters of special significance to the United States. In recent years, Jeane Kirkpatrick and other US representatives to the United Nations closely followed voting by the delegations of non-aligned countries and unscrupulously reprimanded them, orally or in writing, for "improper behaviour", threatening them with financial and economic punishment.

It would be strange to expect the United States to confine itself merely to chastising developing countries, and not to try and draw them, one way or another, into its "crusade" against communism and the socialist community. Amidst the international tensions at the turn of the 1980s, US diplomacy and propaganda started a big and dishonest game. Playing on the natural striving of the young states for peace and security, they have revived the flyblown allegation about a "Soviet military threat", which has long been disproved by life. Generals and financiers in the US Administration and their counterparts in the cabinets of other imperialist powers go out of their way to mislead non-aligned and other developing countries and intimidate them with a "Soviet military threat".

As they lost Iran, their outpost at the Soviet border, and tried to infiltrate another state bordering on the USSR—Afghanistan—but came up against preemptive actions by Afghan patriots supported, on their request, by Soviet troops, the US imperialists and their allies raised the so-called Afghan issue at the UN, using their diplomacy and propaganda to slander the USSR. That

was followed by the just as artificial "Kampuchea issue" aimed against Vietnam; and the liberation of Namibia was made conditional on the withdrawal from Angola of Cuban troops invited there by the Angolan government. The USA and other imperialist powers, moreover, style themselves "guardians" of stability and peace, "defenders" of Islam and "champions of non-interference".

These years Western diplomacy and propaganda concentrated on the non-aligned movement. After many years of ostensible hostility towards the movement, the United States and other imperialist powers have changed tactics. Believing it is hopeless to go headlong against the movement, as in the Dulles years, US diplomats, like those of other Western states for that matter, do not spare phrases of "respect" for it. The earlier designed concept of "genuine non-alignment", now backed up also by the NATO Council, is being imposed on the non-aligned countries. Under this slogan US diplomacy has displayed great zeal to influence as much as it can the decisions of non-aligned meetings and the policy of individual member countries in a bid to divert them from the anti-imperialist course onto "decently moderate" positions.

Styling itself a peacemaker in the Middle East and South Africa, the USA seeks agreements à la Camp David to bolster the international positions of its "strategic allies"—Israel and South Africa. Simultaneously, the USA and other NATO countries have stepped up propaganda attacks on the non-aligned countries which have taken a more resolute anti-imperialist stand, primarily those maintaining friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

These are the main developments characterizing the international position of the non-aligned countries in the 1980s. It is quite obvious that the objective circumstances confronted them with the urgent need to respond to the dramatic changes in the political and economic situation in the world, as well as to the situation in these countries themselves. This response made itself felt pretty soon in the activities of the non-aligned movement and in the policy of many of its members.

## 2. Variations of the Policy of Non-Alignment

As is known, any tension and pressure cause three kinds of reaction: some protest and resist the pressure, others succumb to it and sometimes even acknowledge the will of someone else to be their own, while still others show the white feather or rush about in search for a position to assume.

Under the new spell of international tensions and all-round pressure exerted by neocolonialists and the debt crisis, vacillations inherent in non-alignment increased, revealing the diverse composition of the movement. Certain ideological differences among the non-aligned countries, inevitable as they were from the outset, now increased still more, particularly on specific international issues. As a result, Indira Gandhi noted, the non-aligned movement was weakened because of growing disagreement among its members.

The main line of division runs between the two primary trends in the policy of non-alignment—one trend is towards the stepping up of the struggle against imperialism and the other is towards compromise with it, towards “equidistance”.

The former trend is still predominant on the whole and is most clearly manifest in the policy of non-alignment pursued by long-suffering heroic Vietnam and by Cuba, this Island of Freedom. This is seen, in particular, from the ardent call for a radical solution to the debt problem voiced by Fidel Castro in 1985, and from the vicious attacks of imperialist diplomacy and propaganda on the policy of Cuba and Vietnam.

However, the positions of non-aligned countries on various specific problems are so diverse that any division of these countries into permanent political groups reflecting either of the two trends would be rather conventional. Every now and then one and the same country would ally itself with one or another group over some specific issue, or back up the majority for the sake of consensus. As a consequence, both trends often coexist in the policy of one and the same country. Sometimes foreign policies of certain non-aligned countries represent

a mixture of anti-imperialism and anti-Sovietism, and some of them even joined the imperialists in their plans and actions.

This confusion among the non-aligned caused heated debates over the non-alignment concept, the criteria and essence of the policy of non-alignment, and the role of the non-aligned movement in world politics. In these conditions, the dispute is not abstract but has a direct bearing on the balance of world forces, whenever specific problems of peace, security, national liberation and social and economic advancement are being decided. Naturally, it influences the present and future of non-alignment as a policy and as an international association.

In academic debates among the students of non-alignment on what it really is—a political philosophy, a foreign policy or merely one instrument of policy, namely, diplomacy—the answer is provided by life. When we compare the attitudes of numerous non-aligned countries to this question, it turns out that there cannot be one answer here, that there exist a few varieties of non-alignment. For some non-aligned countries it is a world outlook and a stable political philosophy determining their constructive goals and course in international affairs. For others it is the fundamental line of foreign policy aimed at using international contradictions for bolstering their own positions. For still others it is merely an instrument of foreign policy, a diplomacy based on pragmatism. All these elements can, of course, be present in the non-aligned policy of some state or another, but in this case it is only a stable proportion of them that will determine precisely this country's attitude to non-alignment.

The hard period in the international relations and in the economic conditions of the newly-free countries appeared to be the touchstone revealing what the non-alignment of a country is really worth. During this period, staunchness and consistency in foreign policy was preserved primarily by those countries for which non-alignment is a state philosophy, so to speak. It proved most important for the non-aligned movement, for preserving its original image, that the countries which from the outset were anti-imperialist have not lost their active

and leading role. The anti-imperialist policy of India bears this out only too well.

Back in 1975, a convention of the Indian National Congress stressed in its final document that the policy of non-alignment had been elaborated not for some specific situation but as an approach, as a philosophy designed for a new system of international relations based on equality, peace, freedom and cooperation. This philosophy of non-alignment conceived by Jawaharlal Nehru is now shared by many other non-aligned countries.

Indira Gandhi, who succeeded Nehru as Prime Minister of India, remained faithful to his ideas and continued to develop the political philosophy of non-alignment. It is better, of course, to use her own words to set forth her idea of non-alignment.

Indira Gandhi believed non-alignment rested on two foundations—philosophical and political.

This is what she had to say on the philosophy of non-alignment in an interview to the Bulgarian newspaper *Rabotnichesko Dyelo* in October 1981: "The newly free countries, like India, individually wanted to stay out of Great Power confrontation. Our aim was two-fold—that our resources should not be diverted from development to defence and that we could play a role of friendship and conciliation between both blocs so as to diminish the chances of yet another war. This is the underlying philosophy of non-alignment."

Some time later, in July 1982, Indira Gandhi elaborated on this idea during her visit to the United States: "The world is one, yet we treat it as many, giving different names to the segments. As they are politically used, the words East and West, North and South are not even geographically apt." And then she quoted from an ancient Indian legend: "Do not push me from the West or from the East or from the North or the South, be gracious to us, oh, Earth, let not those find us who waylay people on the road. Take deadly weapons far away from us." Indira Gandhi always believed that independence, development, disarmament and peace were indivisible.

Characterizing the non-aligned movement from these broad positions, Indira Gandhi said in the closing address



to the Delhi Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in March 1983 that it was not a casual collection of individual states but a vital historical process. It is a commingling of many historical, spiritual and cultural streams, and an expression of the aspirations of the long-deprived and the newly-free, she said.

Indira Gandhi called the movement the non-aligned community of countries having common interests, goals and principles, and stressed: "At no time was there any intention to set up a third world." We all are individual countries, she declared. Indira Gandhi defined the movement as an association of independent sovereign states.

As regards the political foundation of non-alignment, Indira Gandhi described it in February 1981 by quoting Mahatma Gandhi: "India wants to be independent of everybody who wants to own this country. We do not want a change of masters. We want to be masters on our own soil." These words," she said, "characterize the political foundation of non-alignment."<sup>8</sup>

Indira Gandhi always believed that the roots of non-alignment were in the anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples. The policy of non-alignment is not a spin-off of the cold war and a confrontation of forces in the postwar bipolar world. This policy is a logical outcome of our liberation struggle, she said. She recalled the movement of non-cooperation with the colonial authorities in India, headed by Mahatma Gandhi, saying that India's experience had given rise to the concept of non-alignment, this logical continuation of the spirit of non-cooperation with colonialism. Indira Gandhi called non-alignment a logical expression of foreign policy whose content was the anti-imperialist struggle waged by the people in Asia, Africa and elsewhere.

Elaborating on the policy of non-alignment, Indira Gandhi noted: "As the logical corollary, we rejected the enmities of our erstwhile rulers."<sup>9</sup> And in her speech at the 1983 non-aligned summit in Delhi she put it all straight: "Anti-imperialism still conditions our outlook."

Indira Gandhi never thought of non-alignment in terms of neutrality and rejected "equidistance". She said:

"It is untenable to interpret non-alignment as equidistance from the superpowers. On the contrary, non-alignment is something very positive."

Guided by national interests and the interests of world peace, Indira Gandhi clearly distinguished between the friends and foes of non-aligned India. She resolutely rejected the allegations that India's policy was "pro-Soviet" and that it disagreed with the principles of non-alignment. "Indo-Soviet friendship is not aimed against any other country," she objected. "It is of equal importance to both India and the Soviet Union. Neither country has ever sought to impose its perceptions on the other. Yet our agreement on vital issues outweighs divergence." "The need for this friendship and its *genuineness* (italics mine. — Yu.A.)," she said, "cannot be questioned." "But how," she reasoned, "can we not accept those who hold out the hand of friendship or come to our assistance in our times of need, especially when we are denied help from any other quarters?"

"We are gratified with and proud of our friendship with the Soviet Union. It is a time-tested friendship and has been of much help to us in our times of difficulty." In her last interview given a few days before her tragic death late in October 1984, Indira Gandhi deemed it necessary to state that India was no doubt a natural inheritor of the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist traditions, which could be traditions of the Soviet Union.

Friendship with the USSR, she stressed, did no harm to India's relations with other countries. "Unfortunately, this has not been appreciated by some countries who take the view that either we are completely with them or we are against them. It has even been stated openly that non-alignment is 'immoral'," she said. That led her to the following conclusion: "This attitude makes them *anti-India*." (Italics mine.—Yu.A.)

Indira Gandhi rejected outright all assertions that the non-aligned movement was not anti-imperialist. Anti-imperialism and anti-racism, she believed, were the basis of the movement.

Her attitude to the non-alignment policy of other countries was likewise strict. "We welcomed Pakistan's

entry into the non-aligned movement," she said in 1981. "But do their new intentions fit in with non-alignment or are they going back to their old policies?" "...Now," she explained, "Pakistan's defence seems once again to be becoming part of a larger strategic alignment stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean, to say nothing of the Indian Ocean in between."

It should be stressed in this context that Indira Gandhi always paid special attention to the struggle of non-aligned countries for peace and security. Throughout the years in the office of India's Prime Minister, and chairman of the non-aligned movement (1983-84), Indira Gandhi strongly insisted on limiting and reversing the arms race, the nuclear arms race above all, averting a new world war, and ensuring a peaceful coexistence of all states. She believed that the non-aligned movement was the largest movement for peace in history and that the realities of the world situation—the possibility of a nuclear armageddon by a single lapse or rash act—reinforced the relevance of non-alignment and demanded its rededication to peace.

Indira Gandhi was a consistent champion of peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts between states. "I feel things should be settled by negotiations and not by fighting,"<sup>10</sup> she said. For that purpose she even assumed a neutral position in the Iran-Iraq conflict. When she was asked by a correspondent of the French *Le Figaro* in December 1980 whether India's "neutrality" in the Iran-Iraq war accorded with the non-alignment principle, she replied that India had friendly relations with both countries, and if it sided with any of them, the situation could get worse, while others would have a pretext for interference, leaving India no chance to act as a mediator when time came for it.

But she protested against absolutizing this approach and did not regard it as universal. Indira Gandhi did not treat non-alignment as a dogma and her own fundamental approach to international conflicts and actions by the conflicting sides depended on the objective circumstances in all their interrelationships. There is one truth, but wisdom interprets it in different ways, she would say, recalling an old Indian proverb, and explained: "We do

not shirk hard choices or their consequences." She knew well that a nation which had been frequently subjected to invasions had to be specially careful about its security.

This approach to conflicts allowed India to take the right stand on the Afghan and Kampuchean issues artificially stirred up in the West to provoke attacks on the Soviet Union, Afghanistan, Vietnam and Kampuchea.

Indira Gandhi firmly objected to the attempts of US diplomacy and propaganda to exploit the "Afghan issue" for laying the blame for increased world tensions at the Soviet Union's door. When asked by an Australian correspondent in September 1981 if the growth of tension started with Afghanistan, she replied: "Oh, no. It has been there before. Afghanistan was in a way inevitable... The Soviet Union felt itself encircled... I think that the first steps were taken by the West." And in January next year she reaffirmed that opinion: "I don't think that the Soviet presence in Afghanistan is the beginning of the cold war because the foreign presence in the Indian Ocean, not only in quantity but in quality, I mean the nuclear weapons and so on, all this began before the Soviets went into Afghanistan."<sup>1</sup> By the "foreign presence in the Indian Ocean" she obviously meant the US Navy with its base on Diego Garcia.

Indira Gandhi categorically rejected anti-Soviet lies about Soviet help to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. India did not consider that the Soviet Union had invaded that country, she said, because the USSR moved a limited military contingent into Afghanistan at the request of the Afghan government.

Her approach was just as unequivocal to the entry of Vietnamese troops in Kampuchea. "I wouldn't call it Vietnam's occupation of Kampuchea by any means," she said. "Vietnam's intervention in Kampuchea," she went on, "cannot be isolated from the context of the barbarous dictatorship of Pol Pot and the external interests in sustaining it." "Now we could not possibly support the Pol Pot regime after what we say they have done," she declared.

On the basis of her analysis of the situation in Indochina and the Middle East, Indira Gandhi, by contrast

with the leaders of many other non-aligned countries, officially recognized the People's Republic of Kampuchea. She openly criticized those who denounced the actions of the USSR and Vietnam. "I cannot but remark on the double standards that are being applied. Those who are expressing horror at events in Afghanistan were conspicuously silent when outside forces entered your own country not so long ago," she said, receiving Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Pham Van Dong in April 1980.

The correctness of this remark addressed to those who condemned non-aligned Vietnam for its aid to the Kampuchean people was confirmed that same year when the troops of another non-aligned country—Tanzania—helped the people of neighbouring Uganda to topple the dictatorial regime of Idi Amin: nobody had raised an "Ugandan issue".

The profound elaboration of non-alignment problems won Indira Gandhi great respect in the world. She helped India pursue consistently an independent foreign policy amidst the world tensions of 1980s. Her staunchness in resisting the powerful pressure exerted by the forces of imperialism and her adherence to a carefully weighed and realistic policy of non-alignment in defence of peace, freedom and progress when she chaired the non-aligned movement, enhanced India's international prestige and helped build up the unity of the non-aligned countries. Rajiv Gandhi, who succeeded her as Prime Minister, and who headed the non-aligned movement in 1984, is successfully carrying on the cause of his mother.

Unlike India, which is a big country with a large population and a relatively developed economy, many other non-aligned states, especially the small ones, those which are considered least developed, were to a greater extent affected by the worsened international situation, by pressure from the West and economic setbacks. Numerous armed conflicts, old and new, the increased aggressiveness of the imperialist powers and the nuclear war threat revived neutralist tendencies in their policy of non-alignment. These countries toned down their demands addressed to the imperialist powers, and some of them

made big political concessions to the West and even joined it in its aggressive plans and actions. It turned out that there exist non-aligned countries which consider they should pursue an active policy of peace in peacetime and may remain neutral in wartime.

It is not a new phenomenon in history that a country may combine non-alignment and neutrality in its policy and in terms of international law. Cambodia, which took part in the First Non-Aligned Conference, held in Belgrade in 1961, had declared itself neutral four years before that, in January 1957. Laos, which attended the 1964 Cairo Summit Conference for the first time as a non-aligned country, had announced its neutrality two years before that, in 1962, and its neutrality was then recognized by the Geneva meeting of 14 states in a Declaration the Neutrality of Laos. But at that time neutral countries were becoming non-aligned.

However, amidst the international tensions of the 1980s, the reverse process has begun. It was set off by non-aligned Malta.

The government of Malta, it will be recalled, announced its wish to become neutral already in the 1970s, when it was still tied up to London by the Agreement on Mutual Defence and Assistance and British troops, an air base and NATO's Mediterranean naval headquarters were stationed on its territory. At the time that move was regarded as a wish to get rid of foreign military presence and ensure the republic's sovereignty and security. After Malta joined the non-aligned movement in 1973, its wish of neutrality was backed up by non-aligned meetings. Finally, the Maltese government, which succeeded in driving NATO's naval headquarters away from the country in 1971, had the British troops and their base removed in 1979.

Today, Malta needs the status of neutrality to guard itself against being drawn in NATO, which still hopes to lay its hands on this strategically important island, or against any military intervention. The history of Malta shows what military ties can lead to: during the war the country was the target of severe strikes, said the foreign minister of Malta speaking in parliament in March 1983.

In our nuclear age, he went on, should Malta be a member of a military alliance, it would immediately be used as a military base, which would jeopardize its independence still more. The main objective of Malta's policy of neutrality is to avoid such a threat. At the same time Malta has not given up an active policy of non-alignment in international affairs, in particular, in the drive for turning the Mediterranean into a zone of peace and cooperation.

In May 1980, the Maltese government came up with a declaration of neutrality, which was endorsed a year later by parliament and became a law. The Declaration says that "the Republic of Malta is a neutral state actively pursuing peace, security and social progress among all nations by adhering to a policy of non-alignment and refusing to participate in any military alliance".<sup>1 2</sup>

The status of neutrality was guaranteed to non-aligned Malta by a special agreement with Italy in September 1980; and in February next year it was recognized and supported at the Delhi meeting of foreign ministers of non-aligned countries; it was recognized and supported by the Soviet Union in October 1981; and in December that same year France, Greece, Iran, the People's Republic of China, Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and other Arab countries promised to respect that status. The non-aligned summit conference, held in Delhi in March 1983, regarded the new status of Malta as "an effective contribution to peace and stability in the Mediterranean region". The conference participants "pledged their support for this status, and urged all other countries to do so".<sup>3</sup>

But what does this combination of non-alignment and neutrality actually mean in terms of international law? According to the government declaration, which became a law in Malta and enjoys international recognition, Malta has committed itself not to allow an establishment of foreign military bases on its territory, not to grant its military facilities to foreign armed forces, not to admit to its territory foreign military personnel except for cases associated with exercising the right to self-defence and actions by the UN Security Council, and not to provide

its shipyards for repairing warships. As we see it, Malta's new status includes broader and more clear-cut commitments than those assumed by a NAM member. Considering that the Maltese government prohibited the ships of the US 6th Fleet from calling at the country's ports way back in the 1970s, it is an easy guess that the extension of this practice by Malta will help curb US imperialism and thus serve the cause of peace.

The attitude to non-alignment as mere diplomacy to be used by the NAM countries for receiving material benefits is yet another old phenomenon which has grown to wide proportions, especially after the financial and economic situation worsened in many of these countries.

Incidentally, this kind of "non-aligned" diplomacy is practiced by the governments which preach "equidistance" and "pure" or "genuine non-alignment". This concept in some or other form has become rather widespread among non-aligned countries in recent years and is worth analysing.

### **3. "Genuine Non-Alignment"**

Today, when international tensions have increased, those in the non-aligned world who are opposed to the "import of foreign ideologies", to participation in the ideological struggle between the two world social systems—socialism and capitalism—and to a politicization of this struggle, have grown visibly active. Simultaneously the search has increased for a special ideology of non-aligned countries, which would unite all of them and serve as an ideological basis for the movement as a whole.

But it is becoming ever more obvious that in our time no ideological seclusion of newly-free countries is possible, and they cannot escape the all-penetrating influence of one or another ideology that exists in the world. And not only influence. Ideas know no bounds today. In the past centuries, too, ideas, especially progressive ideas, travelled far and wide, only at a slower pace than now, for there was no radio or other modern mass media.

It would be naive to deny the direct ideological in-



fluence of the Soviet Union on the development of the national liberation movement today. The ideas of the Great October Socialist Revolution and the Soviet foreign policy of peace meet the aspirations of the peoples of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania. Hence the great influence of these ideas on the struggle of these peoples for complete and final emancipation, for peace and progress. They have also influenced the evolution of the anti-imperialist concept and policy of non-alignment. This is a commonly recognized fact. Moreover, it has had a favourable effect on the development of the non-aligned movement as a peace- and freedom-loving political force.

This cannot be said, however, about the ideology of imperialism, which has always been hostile, and, consequently, unacceptable, to the peoples of former colonies and semi-colonies.

Therefore the West is zealously creating ideological myths and concepts obscuring its true intentions and adapting them more or less to the conditions and sentiments prevailing in the Third World. The imperialist mass media circulate these myths and concepts in developing countries where they are fertilized by nationalism and often take a "national" form. In essence, however, this is ideological subversion pure and simple.

One of the chief objectives of this subversion is to tear the national liberation movement away from the world anti-imperialist front, to set the peoples and governments of the Third World against socialism and the socialist countries and thus to split and weaken the world revolutionary forces. The ideologists of imperialism have realized that their best chances lie in gambling on the social and economic backwardness of developing countries, on their poverty and their striving for greater independence—something to which these countries are most sensitive. Now let us look into how this gamble works.

To a capitalist the principle of dividing people into rich and poor is the main one in the world of private property, and, for want of other ideas, it was most simple for spokesmen of capitalism in Western science and politics to apply this principle to relations among states. So,

in the late 1950s and early 1960s a good deal was published in New York and Paris about "rich and poor nations", and US presidents began to speak of "rich and poor countries". That was followed by contrasting geographic regions of the world, the "rich" North and the "poor" South, with one another. Thus the concept of "rich and poor nations" came into being.

According to this concept, the main conflict of our epoch is the one between the developing and industrialized states, irrespective of their social system or the source of their "wealth", no matter if this source is colonialist or neocolonialist exploitation or the selfless labour of the country's population. Thus both capitalist and socialist countries were lumped in the group of "rich nations" and declared to be opposed to the "poor countries".

The concept of "rich and poor countries" gave rise to a similar concept of "equidistance from blocs and great powers" and then to its version of "genuine" or "pure" non-alignment. The former was designed for the developing countries to use it in foreign economic relations. The latter was political expression of the former and was obviously expected to be accepted by the non-aligned countries which would use it in foreign policy. As distinct from the concept of "rich and poor nations", it seems to take into account the fact that the group of the "rich" consists of two subgroups, though both are "rich" all the same and therefore the attitude to them should be the same.

It may seem at first glance that both concepts are directed equally against imperialist and socialist countries. But their true aim is to break the union of the national liberation forces and the socialist countries. This becomes abundantly clear if one recalls the concern expressed in the West merely over the idea that such union is possible. "As I see it," said Harold Macmillan, the then Prime Minister of Great Britain, in 1960, "the great issue in this second half of the twentieth century is whether the uncommitted peoples of Asia and Africa will swing to the east or to the west. Will they be drawn into the Communist camp?" <sup>14</sup>

One would not fail to notice that the USA and the other imperialist powers eagerly back up the principle of dividing the world according to wealth into two opposed parts and the principle of dividing it, in political terms, into three parts. Evidently all this does not really worry the monopolies and governments of the West whose main concern is to split the anti-imperialist forces of the Third World so as to ward off, or at least weaken, their main blow. The neocolonialists are sure that any harm caused by the application of these concepts can easily be made up for if they retain the developing countries within the world capitalist economic system and hold commanding posts in this system and in the economies of these countries.

Indeed, as is seen from the course of events and the political consequences of the debt problem in these countries' relations with the West in the 1980s, Western interests have not suffered at all from the spread of the concepts of "rich and poor nations", "equidistance" or "genuine non-alignment". For instance, in December 1982, that is, shortly before the Delhi Summit Conference of Non-Aligned Countries, the NATO Council confirmed at its session in Brussels the Western countries' preparedness to continue to cooperate with the Third World in the same way on the basis of "equal partnership", and spoke for a "genuine non-alignment" of developing countries.

One has to be blind not to see that the political, military, economic and ideological pressure of the West, compounded by the objective financial and economic difficulties of the non-aligned and other developing countries, has ultimately influenced the foreign policy pursued by the governments of some of these countries. Besides, they have obviously grown tired of the many years of confrontation with imperialism and of the fears of its encroachment on their sovereignty. In a number of these countries, politicians, scientists and journalists rise to the bait: deliberately or more often because they fail to see well enough the realities of our time, they develop the ideas prompted to them with such zeal that an inexperienced person may think these ideas had been first

formulated by them. Only the answer to the question "Who stands to gain from this?" would spotlight the true backstage authors of these subversive ideas. Lenin repeatedly stressed: "In politics it is not so important *who* directly advocates particular views. What is important is *who stands to gain* from these views..."<sup>15</sup>

There is an exception to any rule, as we all know. Such is the dialectic of life. The terms themselves do not explain everything. The concept of "equidistance" or "genuine non-alignment", for instance, is not always inspired by the West and does not always serve its interests. When it is arrived at from the right, after breaking with imperialist powers, leaving their blocs, and removing their military bases, this is done against the wishes of the imperialists. And in this particular case, going over to "equidistance from military-political blocs" is not passive neutrality but an active anti-imperialist action.

This was how present-day Iran and many other countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America set out as members of the non-aligned movement. Their choice of non-alignment as a foreign-policy course was a logical outcome of the national liberation struggle and reflected their natural desire for full independence in the world. "However different the newly-free countries may be from one another and whatever road they follow," stated the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its Programme, "their peoples are united by desire to develop independently, on their own, and to run their affairs without foreign interference. The Soviet Union is full in solidarity with them."

This applies also to some countries' course of "equal proximity" or development of relations "along all lines", that is, with all states in the world. In practice this means that in specific positions the stress is on anti-imperialist demands, on the desire of Asian, African and Latin American countries to free their international relations from the age-old Western dominance.

It is another matter when the stress is deliberately shifted to the right, and a non-aligned country is prodded towards political rapprochement with the neocolonialists

and away from the world's revolutionary, progressive forces, above all the socialist community.

However, the covert preachers of this kind of "equidistance" or "genuine non-alignment" wish to make this concept an ideological basis for the non-aligned countries. Quite a few politicians, scholars and journalists—among whom there are both its sincere champions and demagogues—have gradually elaborated numerous arguments to back it up, arguments that look more like a philosophy, a system of views on the political, social, economic and international legal aspects of non-alignment.

But what is the essence of "genuine non-alignment" which claims to offer an exhaustive definition of the role of the movement in history and in the system of modern international relations?

This concept is based on assertions that, for instance, the principles of non-alignment should be equally applied to NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, and also in assessing the actions of the United States and the Soviet Union. Both blocs are claimed to be equally to blame for striving for hegemony, and the present extreme aggravation of world tensions is explained by a "rivalry between the two superpowers", for which the USA and the USSR are held equally responsible.

It is also asserted that solution of the social and economic problems confronting the developing countries is not directly related with the anti-imperialist struggle, that non-alignment in general does not mean political or economic confrontation with the imperialist West, and that the non-aligned countries do not, and cannot, have either natural enemies or natural allies. The non-aligned movement is thus presented as a separate "third force" capable of influencing the course of world events independently, without allying itself with other progressive forces in the world; as a "supreme judge" for all nations and for all international events. It is proclaimed the decisive factor and the most progressive and genuine motive power of all positive changes in the world, the main creator of the future system of international relations.

The above-listed and other postulates concerning the "genuine non-alignment" concept clearly reflect the striv-

ing for complete independence of judgements and positions. This logical wish of non-aligned countries is easy to understand. And the argument around "genuine non-alignment" and "equidistance" is just as natural, though the difference between the two is in fact vanishing as soon as the intention to make the non-aligned movement an isolated "third force" in the world arena comes to the surface.

Evidently any search for a modified version of the non-alignment policy still can be useful if the lessons of the past and present, objective reality and the vital interests of the newly-free countries are taken into account. But precisely here is the weak link in the philosophy of "equidistance" and "genuine non-alignment". Primarily because it is at variance with reality and practical experience, and with the objective interests of the non-aligned countries themselves.

The aims of "genuine non-alignment", if viewed in terms of political realities, reveal quite clearly that the great, though limited, possibilities of the national liberation movement are overestimated, while those of the other progressive forces are underrated. For instance, the objective decisive significance of such a universally powerful force of today as the socialist community for world development and the progress of international relations is obviously underestimated.

There could be at least some justification for the concept of "genuine non-alignment" or "equidistance", if the non-aligned countries really found themselves between the devil and the deep blue sea. But in the present situation this concept does not hold water, for the policies of the blocs and the great powers, from which the non-aligned countries should allegedly be equidistant, are quite different. The non-aligned countries have had an opportunity to see on many occasions that the threat to their vital interests, to their political independence and economic security, comes only from the imperialist powers and the monopolies.

Only those who do not wish to analyze the situation objectively, without an anti-Soviet bias, can be misguided by the allegation that the aims and actions of both blocs

in the world arena are the same and should therefore be approached similarly. *Si duo faciunt idem—non est idem* (if two people do the same thing, it is not the same thing)—this dictum of Ancient Romans is well applicable in this case.

There is a fundamental difference, for instance, between the purposes and principles of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty, the two politico-military groupings.

Now let us make a short excursion to history. After the October 1917 Revolution Soviet Russia was attacked several times by the imperialist powers, which acted jointly, as a rule. Among them were the USA, Britain, France, Germany and some other countries. None of them has ever been attacked by the Soviet Union, which has always championed peaceful coexistence. During World War II, the USSR was the main target of the German and Italian aggressors and had to defend itself. The immense losses and devastation that war brought to the peoples of the Soviet Union makes them always remember the lessons of history, keep their powder dry and strengthen their defence capability.

However, it is not the socialist countries which started the division of Europe, and the world, into military blocs. Even in 1949, the year when NATO was formed, the socialist countries did not respond by setting up a bloc of their own, though they had every reason to do just that. Only six years later, when the war machine of West Germany was added to NATO and the danger of a revival of German militarism increased, the socialist countries, remembering the bitter lessons of the past war, formed their own defensive alliance—the Warsaw Treaty Organization. That move was imposed on the socialist community and was a necessary measure of self-defence, an exercise of the right to collective defence in keeping with the United Nations Charter. When the other side takes up the sword, one should not lay down the shield, otherwise the aggressor would be tempted to attack.

By contrast with NATO, the socialist defensive alliance threatens no one and its only purpose is to defend the peaceful work and historic gains of its people. Ever since its formation in 1955, the Warsaw Treaty countries have

never called for "crusades", but have advanced innumerable peace proposals and issued calls for making Europe a continent of collective security without blocs. On more than one occasion the Warsaw Treaty countries have expressed their readiness to disband the Warsaw Treaty provided NATO does the same, or at least, as the first move, to eliminate the military organizations of both the Warsaw Treaty and NATO.

But the Warsaw Treaty proposals were turned down and the Western military treaty, signed for an indefinite period, continues to exist. Under the circumstances, the Warsaw Treaty countries had to prolong (in April 1985) the term of the Warsaw Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance for another 20 years. But even after that, at the summit meeting of the Warsaw Treaty countries, held in October 1985 in Sofia, the Political Consultative Committee of the alliance reaffirmed its readiness for a simultaneous disbandment of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, and the elimination of their military organizations as the first move.

The same is true of the attempts to put the "two superpowers" on the same plane by alleging that it is their "rivalry", and not the increased aggressiveness and hegemonistic ambitions of US imperialism, that is the source of the present aggravation of world tensions. The Soviet Union is blamed for its armaments, and the theorists of "equidistance" and "genuine non-alignment" are eagerly holding forth on a "Soviet military threat" in a bid to equate the Soviet foreign policy of peace with the deliberately aggressive foreign policy of the United States.

Meanwhile, it is enough merely to compare facts to see that the "superpowers" differ a lot from each other. It is true the Soviet Union is one of the two most powerful countries in the world, and no one can make it smaller or weaker than it is. But the main thing is that the USSR and the USA, strong as they are, pursue quite different objectives. As distinct from the USA, the Soviet Union threatens no one and does not hanker after foreign territories and resources. The Soviet people are content with the world's largest area of their country, with its natural



resources and outlets to seas and oceans. They have their hands full at home, and to solve their own problems they need peace and peaceful coexistence with other countries.

This is understood perfectly well in many non-aligned countries. India's Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, for instance, stated in May 1985 that the Soviet people's adherence to the cause of peace originated from their ideals and was accounted for by the fact that no other nation had suffered from a war so much.

The authors and champions of the "equidistant" formula of "the rivalry between the two superpowers" may be asked in this context: How can the Soviet people safeguard peace, protect their socialist system and ensure the country's security without building up the defence capability of their country, without a political contention ("rivalry") with imperialism? To be sure, imperialism is not going to renounce its hegemonistic designs and threats to the Soviet Union. But the concept of "equidistance" or "genuine non-alignment" does not, and cannot, provide an answer to this logical question.

The Soviet people, naturally, have the right to security. Moreover, history shows they have every reason to build up their defences in the face of a possible aggression on the part of the imperialists who are rapidly arming on earth and are ready to manufacture strike weapons to attack the USSR from outer space. In these conditions a logical Soviet response to this challenge cannot be, of course, unilateral disarmament, but increased defence capability. A revolution must be able to defend itself. "One should face the reality and see how the situation is taking shape," Mikhail Gorbachev said. "These are serious matters and they cannot be disguised by ... demagoguery. In actual fact, it is the destinies of nations and the destiny of peace that are at issue."

If the "two superpowers" are urged to end "rivalry over influence in the world", and equal demands are placed on them, this is the result of either ignorance or malicious intent. At any rate, it cannot be applied to the Soviet Union which has always worked for starting disarmament, against any military confrontation, particularly with the United States, and, as distinct from the USA,

is not responsible for the current crisis in international relations.

The Soviet Union is not to blame that local conflicts flare up in various parts of the world. Besides, the champions of "equidistance" would do better to try and imagine what would be left of their countries' independence and what the situation in the world would be, if the Soviet Union were weaker than it is and if the Soviet people did not put so much work, material resources and scientific thought in maintaining their economic and defence capability at the required level. The USSR has always been on the side of the peoples threatened by imperialism, and on the side of the states on whose sovereignty and rights the imperialists encroach.

This prompts yet another reason why it is not right to speak about a "rivalry of superpowers" and their "equal responsibility". There is a fundamental difference between their practical actions on the international arena: Soviet moves are, as a rule, consonant with the interests of non-aligned countries, while US actions run counter to them. Moreover, even if the historical competition of the two opposite social and economic systems and the struggle between their foreign-policy lines is called "rivalry", the question remains: Would the ending of such "rivalry" by the Soviet Union alone benefit the non-aligned states? Evidently not.

The theory of "equidistance" and "genuine non-alignment" is at variance with reality, with the objective processes going on in international relations.

Viewed against the background of the original anti-imperialist thrust of the non-aligned movement, this concept turns out to be basically incompatible with it.

To the West this incompatibility is exactly what it has sought to achieve for many years. The USA, it will be recalled, already in the early 1960s began to apply the term "genuinely non-aligned" only to those non-bloc countries which followed a pro-Western foreign-policy line, or a course close to it. And, on the other hand, it did all it could to "excommunicate" from non-alignment the newly-free countries which assumed a consistently anti-imperialist stance. The fiercest attacks were levelled

at Cuba, especially after Fidel Castro was elected NAM Chairman in 1979. But after the 1983 non-aligned meeting, the Paris session of the NATO Council reiterated in a communique its "respect" for the principles of "sovereignty and genuine non-alignment". Visiting the capitals of the countries which in their view were "genuinely non-aligned", Western statesmen went out of their way to extol those countries' "genuine non-alignment".

So what "genuine non-alignment" do the imperialists care for so much and what "equidistance" do they support? At closer examination it turns out that to them non-alignment is "genuine" when it fits into their plans of using non-aligned countries, at least partially, in the interests of the West, and turning the NAM itself into a kind of reserve in their struggle against the USSR and the socialist community as a whole.

This is borne out, for instance, by the following statement by US Secretary of State George Shultz in defence of America's "vital interests". "The United States," he said, "cannot defend its interests by operating out of the United States and Europe alone. We need the cooperation of countries in the Third World to grant transit, refueling, and base rights. Otherwise, while we may wish to build up a rapid deployment force, we will be unable to deploy it without Third World friends who will allow us to use their facilities."

In late October 1985, deputy Secretary of State John Whitehead specified Shultz's conclusion just as openly with regard to Africa. The United States, he said, depends on cooperation with a number of African countries to maintain the US military presence in that region, including in the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea. Naturally, Washington can count on such "cooperation" only with the countries which have gone over from anti-imperialist to "equidistant" positions. Thus the imperialist line of backing up the policy of "genuine non-alignment" and the line of building US military bases in "genuinely non-aligned" countries of the Third World—the friends of the United States—converge.

This shows that acceptance of the ideology of "genuine non-alignment" or "equidistance" leads in practice

to a violation of NAM principles and decisions, and of the criteria of membership in the movement which demand, in particular, that foreign bases should not be used "in the context of Great Power conflicts".

At the Delhi Conference in 1983, Fidel Castro said that "it (the United States.—*Ed.*) is seeking agreements to build new military bases in countries which, because of their links with our movement, should renounce the use of their territories for these purposes". This does not apply solely to the bases. Whenever a non-aligned country slides down to the imperialist positions, this undermines the NAM's unity and saps its strength in the struggle for peace and the vital interests of the newly-free states, against neocolonialism. This is why "genuine non-alignment" is so praised in the West. Here the golden rule of politics comes to mind: if you are praised by your enemy, think what mistake you have made to his advantage and your own disadvantage.

There is a peculiarity in this "marriage of convenience" between the "genuinely non-aligned" and the West—it furnishes most explicit proof of the illusoriness of "equidistance" or "genuine non-alignment". A slide down from anti-imperialist to "equidistant" positions ultimately leads non-aligned countries to conciliation with the imperialists.

Today, when international relations are closely intertwined in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism in the world which is divided into two opposed social systems, the existence of a separate "third force" is possible only on paper, while so-called genuine non-alignment or equidistance can exist only in theory, never in practice. This is a utopia, and as any utopia it is bound to fall into pieces the moment it is confronted with reality.

In the present situation of world tensions, when one has to choose, whether one wishes it or not, between peace and war, to choose companions and allies, the NAM cannot be "equidistant" unless it goes to another planet. This is borne out beyond doubt by political practice. Assessing major political and economic problems and conflict situations, and making their demands, the non-

aligned countries do not, as a rule, assume neutralist, or "equidistant" positions. In each particular case they are on either one or the other side, depending on how national interests are understood by a given country.

Analysis of objective data on the 1980s shows that, despite the "theoretical quest" by the ideologists of "equidistance" or "genuine non-alignment", and the attempts to make this concept a reality, anti-imperialist interests prevail in the policy of non-aligned countries and decisions of their meetings. And no contrivances of Western propaganda can negate the coincidence or proximity of the basic interests of non-aligned countries and the international interests of the socialist states, and the need for these countries to act in unity with the socialist community; they cannot break this unity which, objectively, already exists. There are numerous facts to prove this. These facts are a far more confident and convincing answer to the question regarding the role of the non-aligned movement in the world today than the conclusions drawn by the ideologists and champions of "equidistance".

### *Chapter Two. ...But the Caravan Goes Its Own Way*

It is not the first time in world history that in the periods of most acute tensions the alignment of political forces, those which act together and those opposed to one another, is most fully revealed. And it is not superficial, verbal manifestations of friendship or enmity between governments, but the stable interests of the ruling classes or their coalitions, as well as national interests that mainly determine the role played by a country in the world arena.

Various propaganda assertions and many theoretical differences and debates appear to be just a drift of dust easily blown off by the winds of life. This refers to the concept of "equidistance" or "genuine non-alignment", which cannot stand a test of time. In the present conditions of international tensions, which have affected the political and economic interests of non-aligned countries,

the foreign origin and artificial character of this concept have been laid bare. In practice, it is obviously at variance with the main course pursued by the majority of non-aligned countries in the international arena.

Despite the efforts of Western propaganda to use the "equidistance" slogan for setting the non-aligned nations and their governments against the Soviet Union, to "tame" the NAM and make it a movement of non-resistance to imperialism, the movement as a whole proceeds in world politics along the same historical path as all the anti-imperialist and anti-war forces in the world, including the peace-loving Soviet Union. And, as a wise Oriental proverb says, dogs bark but the caravan goes its own way.

### **1. Does the NAM Need Allies? What Are They?**

This natural question has a long history. The time when "perfect isolation" was possible has long since passed forever. Hardly any state in our interdependent world would risk living an isolated life, and even if it does, it cannot fence itself off securely for a long period, and ultimately its own interests make it seek allies, or at least companions, in international affairs.

The NAM countries are not an exception, despite their non-alignment principle, though they do have some specific features. Any young state which has joined the movement has thus confirmed its need of allies, and it looks upon itself and the other members of the movement as such allies. As for the rest of the countries in the world, there, according to champions of "equidistance", one can find no clear answer, especially when it concerns the non-aligned movement as a whole and solidarity between the NAM and the socialist community.

Confusion arises already in the way the question is put: Who is an ally of whom—the NAM of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community, or vice versa. Now and again Western correspondents put this question to leaders of non-aligned countries more plainly: Who supports whom? Strange as it may seem,

the provocation occasionally works. To demonstrate its independence, a non-aligned country sometimes denies that it backs up the USSR's positions, but readily agrees that its positions are supported by the USSR. In this case the notion of "natural alliance" is rejected outright as if it contradicts the principle of non-alignment.

But practice has shown that this question has long been solved. And not only by way of terminology but in objectively existing reality. Other terms can well be found, though there is no need to discard the notion of "natural alliance".

But what is "natural alliance" after all? This is an objective coincidence or proximity of the interests of nations, their actual solidarity and cooperation in the struggle against a common and natural enemy predetermined by history, for common goals. So the question "Who supports whom?" is redundant. Both are allies, but none of them imposes its alliance on the other; both are equally interested in it, and this makes the alliance strong and durable.

What other alliances can there be? Evidently artificial, that is, alliances in which the interests of the members actually diverge, and collaboration is based on coercion of one of them or on a temporary coincidence or proximity of the positions held by the ruling groups. Their enemy is, as a rule, the enemy of just one member of the alliance, they have no common cause, and the artificial alliance is bound to collapse in the end. Such was the fate of CENTO and SEATO, the military-political alliance between Iran and the USA, and most other bilateral alliances of this kind imposed by former colonial powers on Asian and African countries.

However, unable to become natural allies of the non-aligned countries, and objectively being their natural enemies, the imperialist powers have most vigorously used the political, economic, information and other means to sow doubt among the NAM members as to the feasibility of their alliance, solidarity and cooperation with the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole. Using the "equidistance" and "genuine non-alignment" concept as a cover, the imperialists, pretending to care

for the NAM's independence and international prestige, are spreading false rumours about the treaties of friendship and cooperation signed by a number of non-aligned countries with the Soviet Union. In actual fact, however, this concerns the right of these countries to cooperate with socialist states in general and to receive aid from them.

The right of non-aligned countries to alliance and cooperation with socialist countries is a most important question and should be dealt with in more detail.

One cannot fail to see that proponents of "equidistance" assert that the NAM has grown into so great a force that it needs no allies and itself can sway the destinies of the world.

Well, the political weight of the movement has indeed grown in the world and now it plays a big positive role in the effort to solve many key political and economic problems of our time. Nobody denies that. This is recognized and welcomed, above all, by the socialist countries. And the NAM's own potential is doubtlessly expanding.

But is the NAM really so big among the world forces that it can act singlehanded? Can it solve in a face-to-face grapple with the imperialist powers such vital problems as prevention of nuclear war, general and complete disarmament, and a restructuring of international political and economic relations? Can "equidistance" provide more security to the non-aligned countries than their solidarity and cooperation with the other anti-imperialist forces in the world? Do the young states have real chances to overwhelm the imperialist powers and monopolies on their own, without the help of friends and allies? Can they wipe away singlehanded the colonialist legacy and come out effectively against the aggressive guardians of this legacy?

The answer to all these questions can be found in a wise warning by Jawaharlal Nehru: "We must not overestimate our own importance... We must realize both our actual and our potential strength that we have, and also the lack of strength that we have."<sup>16</sup> The non-aligned movement has greatly strengthened its positions in the world since the day Nehru uttered these words, but they



are no less topical today. Only together with the other anti-imperialist forces can the NAM accomplish the tasks it set itself and take part in deciding the fate of the world.

It can be theoretically assumed that "equidistance" could have grounds for emerging prior to October 1917, when groups of imperialist powers fought against one another in World War I, each being hostile to the national liberation movement.

But after the Great October Socialist Revolution Soviet Russia broke away from the system of imperialism, and became in fact the first ever non-aligned country, the main anti-imperialist force, an ally of the liberation movement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. About seventy years back, it was the first to demand a democratization of international relations so that the peoples, who for centuries had been the objects of the policy of others, could be equal participants in international affairs. For many years the Soviet Union had to carry on this noble struggle all alone, encircled by capitalist states, confronting the imperialist world and its economic and military might. The Soviet people emerged victorious from that unequal confrontation.

The geographic area of imperialism shrank still more after World War II, when the community of socialist countries was formed as the basis of the socialist world system, an antipode of the imperialist system. Its existence alone largely helped the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America to carry through their struggle for national freedom.

The reason for this is that the imperialist powers cannot throw all their military might to quash national liberation movements because they need it also to suppress the working-class action at home and to oppose the socialist community, the social conflict with which they consider the most important, despite their own propaganda fabrications about the countries of the world being divided according to their wealth. The stronger the economy and army of the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist community, the more the balance of strength tips in their favour, the more the forces of imperialism

are restrained, and the more confident the developing countries may be in fighting imperialism. It is safe to say that the non-aligned movement as a new anti-imperialist force would not exist, for the imperialists would have nipped it in the bud, if it were not for the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole on which the NAM can rely.

"Without the Soviet Union, the capitalist powers in the conditions of raw materials shortage and energy crisis would not hesitate to redivide the world. Without the Soviet Union, it would be impossible even to imagine either the measure of independence enjoyed today by smaller countries, or the successful struggle of the peoples to regain control over their natural wealth, and their voice would not sound so loud today in the chorus of nations," said Fidel Castro, Prime Minister of Cuba, a leading non-aligned country whose people had come to this conclusion through innumerable suffering. As we all know, many non-aligned countries have acquired similar experience too.

History has given no reason for opposing non-aligned countries to any other states indiscriminately—it has given no reason for "equidistance". This concept became hopelessly obsolete the moment it originated.

In recent years, the US Administration has been most persistent in imposing on its NATO allies and non-aligned countries the view that all developments in the national liberation zone should be regarded in an East-West context. Whatever happens in any part of the world, be it a domestic or an international conflict, it would necessarily seek a "hand of Moscow", accusing the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries of interference and destabilization. So it must be made clear what exactly Washington means by stability or instability.

It appears that the stability sought by the West runs counter to the interests of newly-free states. As regards former colonial and other imperialist powers, this means, above all, stable and unhindered economic exploitation of these states, the firmness of the political and strategic military positions of the West, and the develop-

ment of newly-free countries along the capitalist path.

But the people in developing countries reject the imperialist concept of stability. Refusal to preserve the old order and vestiges of colonialism in international relations, implementation of deep-going social and economic reforms, the choice of socialist orientation, and all-round cooperation with socialist countries—all this is a normal process of national liberation, of social and economic progress and of shaping an independent foreign policy for a large number of young states. And despite occasional zigzags, this logical historical process is fairly stable.

As a result, the situation in developing countries has grown unstable, indeed, for former colonial and other imperialist powers. This means that their positions, especially in politics, are shaken, and the prospects for world capitalism as a whole become ever more bleak. But this is not destabilization of Africa, or Asia, or Latin America. Instability and flimsy prospects for the West and NATO in furthering the global strategic interests of imperialism is what is passed off in Western propaganda as a "destabilization" of the developing world.

Even those in the USA and other Western countries who are hostile to Marxism and the USSR, but are more or less sober-minded, admit that the practically incessant upheavals in the national liberation zone are caused by the unrestrained striving for independence, equality and better economic conditions in developing countries. In the final analysis, this is the result of the imperialist policy of monopoly capital. Lenin had this to say on that score: "In the long run capitalism itself is educating and training the vast majority of the population of the globe for the struggle."<sup>17</sup> This is borne out, in particular, by the events in Iran and Nicaragua, which had been set off by unscrupulous actions of US imperialism, its exploitation of the peoples of these countries and its obvious desire to cultivate the American way of life and perpetuate its hegemony there.

But what have the policy of the USSR and the mythical "Soviet military threat" to do with it? The genuine causes of the struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and

Latin America against imperialism were all there even before the socialist revolution was accomplished in Russia. When the people of Nicaragua put up heroic resistance to the intervention by the US Marines in 1912, whom could Washington accuse? The Soviet Union did not yet exist. Nor did socialist Cuba. And today, when these states do exist, there are no grounds for accusing them of "exporting revolution". Resistance to imperialism is generated by imperialism itself.

It is clear to any unbiased person that revolutions are not exported from Moscow or Havana, but occur only where and when the conditions within a country are ripe for them. Strengthening its defence potential and protecting the interests of socialism and the socialist community, the Soviet Union constantly comes up with peaceful political proposals and works hard to revive detente, but it threatens no one with force. Lenin's words that "Communism cannot be imposed by force"<sup>18</sup> are known well in the Soviet Union. The ideas of communism, by which bourgeois propaganda has been trying to frighten the developing nations for so many years, are not going to be imposed on anyone.

Together with all peace-loving countries, the Soviet Union fully backs up the legitimate demands of the non-aligned countries that all seats of tension created by the imperialists in various parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America should be eliminated.

The Soviet Union has established mutually beneficial bilateral cooperation with young states, renders them economic and other aid, without interfering into their domestic affairs, without imposing its friendship on anyone and promoting it only with those who really want it. The USSR is sincerely interested in international relations being reliably peaceful, so that present tensions should give way to detente both on a global scale and in individual regions, so that they should not be kindled by artificial destabilization and would not grow into a military confrontation.

This policy of the USSR is highly acclaimed in many non-aligned countries. In the past the attitude to it was clearly formulated by Gamal Abdel Nasser.

The USSR, it will be recalled, not only rendered non-aligned Egypt political support in the United Nations, and not only did it help Egypt to start independent economic development by building in that country a number of modern projects in the key sectors of industry, power engineering and transport, but also armed the country so it could defend itself from Israeli aggressors. As the USSR extended that aid, Nasser recalled later, it never demanded that Egypt should become a communist state, the aid had no strings attached and the USSR demanded nothing that could harm in any way Egypt's national pride. The Soviet Union, he stressed, never tried to influence Egypt and never tried to tell it what it should do; it helped Egypt in the best way, asking nothing in return.

In other words, Soviet backing to the anti-imperialist policy of non-alignment does not mean any interference in the domestic affairs or pressurizing the foreign policy of non-aligned countries, which cannot be said about the "respect" of non-alignment preached by the United States and other imperialist powers. As he stressed the vital significance of Soviet aid to non-aligned countries, Nasser had every reason to state in May 1970 that "the Egyptian people highly value Soviet assistance. This is disinterested aid with no strings attached. I cannot even imagine what the situation would be like, if it were not for Soviet aid... Without the Soviet Union and without the friendly countries... we could not speak as loudly as we speak today."

A good deal has been written in the West about weapons deliveries from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to developing states. Evidently it is believed in the West that only arms deliveries from the United States, Western Europe and Israel are normal, and deliveries of weapons from the socialist states to developing countries at the request of the latter are regarded in the West almost as a crime. But why? Only because this undermines the West's monopoly on arms deliveries and narrows down its opportunities to decide which Third World countries should be armed and which should be left unarmed. Perhaps the West is

motivated by good intentions and really cares for the developing countries' security and peace? Nothing of the kind.

The USA, for instance, continues to be the main weapons supplier to developing countries. But weapons are not delivered to national liberation movements and states fighting for independence. Nonetheless, even this strict selection of clients has not saved the United States from the heavy political defeat inflicted on it by the insurgent Iranian people armed with US weapons. So, that is what all references to the "destabilizing role" of Soviet weapons are really worth.

What really matters is not weapons as such but who uses them, why and against whom. If it were not for Soviet weapons, the freedom fighters would not be able to win in Algeria, the Portuguese colonies and Zimbabwe; Cuba would not have repelled the USA's mercenaries in Playa Jiron; Egyptian troops would have been unable to force a crossing of the Suez Canal in 1973; the Vietnamese people would not have won in 1975; and Syrian troops would not be able to check the Israeli aggressor in 1982. On the other hand, Israel conducts its aggression in the Middle East and has committed carnage in Lebanon with the help of US weapons. As we see it, the difference in using weapons is great indeed.

Noting this difference, Houari Boumedienne, the late President of Algeria, declared that Egyptian troops recaptured the Suez Canal by using Soviet weapons, and that other countries stood their ground in struggle thanks to Soviet weapons; all the misfortune, however, had been brought to the Middle East and Africa with the help of Western arms. The truth of these words is borne out by the experience of Algeria and Egypt, Cuba and Vietnam, Angola and Ethiopia, Syria and Nigeria, Guinea and Benin and many other non-aligned countries.

And finally comes the question regarding the presence of troop contingents of socialist countries abroad. Western politicians and journalists accuse the Soviet Union, Cuba and Vietnam of nothing less than "global expansionism". As the saying goes, they see a mote in the other's eye when there is a beam in their own.

Contingents of Soviet troops are now stationed in some allied states of Eastern Europe and in two Asian neighbour countries—Mongolia and Afghanistan—strictly in accordance with agreements concluded with these countries. Why is it considered absolutely natural that the United States, Britain and France have their armed forces stationed thousands of miles away in dozens of countries, whereas the entry of a limited contingent of Soviet troops in neighbouring Afghanistan is presented as a great threat? A threat to whom? To non-aligned Afghanistan which is friendly with the Soviet Union or to those who jeopardize its sovereignty and would like to use that country as a passage-way for acts of provocation at the southern frontiers of the USSR?

The answer is provided by the people and government of Afghanistan, by the developments in that country and around it. And they say clearly enough that the Soviet military contingent in Afghanistan presents no threat to its people and government, to its sovereignty, its policy of non-alignment and its development. The Soviet troops help the Afghan people and government to ensure the country's security in the struggle against the bandits smuggled into Afghanistan and destabilizing the situation there. The Afghan government regards Soviet military assistance not as interference into the affairs of its state but as faithful compliance with the Treaty of Friendship, Goodneighbourliness and Cooperation signed between Afghanistan and the USSR in 1978. But when the USA and its accomplices impose on the government of Afghanistan alien domestic and foreign policies hostile to the USSR, this is justly regarded in Afghanistan as interference in its affairs.

So, who is to be believed—the Soviet and Afghan governments or those who are spreading fabrications about the relations between the countries and have been slandering the Soviet Union for years on end whenever its foreign-policy moves did not suit the West? The Soviet action in Afghanistan is a temporary measure limited strictly to the territory of that country, which in no way threatens any other country bordering on it in the Middle East and South Asia, and, naturally, in no way

affects the interests of other non-aligned states in Asia, Africa or Latin America.

In other words, if the Soviet Union helps its neighbour, can this be called a "threat"? Moreover, the USSR has said it will withdraw its troops by agreement with the Afghan government as soon as foreign interference in Afghan affairs is ended and guarantees are offered that it will not be resumed in future. The USSR is interested in Afghanistan remaining its good neighbour, a neutral and non-aligned state. The Soviet government backs up Afghanistan's desire to achieve a political settlement of problems in its relations with Iran and Pakistan. To secure the settlement it is necessary to reliably put an end to intervention, reach an understanding between Afghanistan and its neighbours, and restore peace and tranquillity in the region.

The position of the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan is therefore utmosty clear. However, the anti-Soviet and anti-Afghan forces headed by the United States continue to fuss about Afghanistan, misinterpret the events to meet their own ends, deliberately confuse the notions of aid and interference, blow the so-called Afghan issue out of all proportions, and clearly obstruct a political solution of the problem. They need a conflict in that region, just as they need lies about a "Soviet military threat", to gain ground there, consolidate their military positions, and ensure their permanent military presence. It suits the militarist, anti-Soviet and neocolonialist forces, but it obviously does not suit the peace-loving non-aligned countries.

Western politicians likewise are making foul use of military aid rendered by Cuba to Angola and Ethiopia, and by Vietnam to Kampuchea. All these countries are in the NAM. So why can't one non-aligned country help another at the request of the latter's people and government? Nonetheless, both Cuba and Vietnam are accused of "interference" because they are not just non-aligned but also socialist states. And this, in the opinion of imperialists, automatically deprives them of the right to render military aid to other countries. The imperialists see this as an immense threat, just as they see it in



similar Soviet actions.

This brings back to the memory a sharp rebuke given by Julius Nyerere, Tanzania's first President, to Western propaganda agencies which claimed that Soviet and Cuban policies posed a "threat" to Africa. A threat to whom—to the freedom of Africa or to the domination in Africa by former colonial powers and their allies, he asked. He said that the Soviet Union and Cuba helped Angola and Ethiopia at the request of their legitimate and recognized governments for reasons that were absolutely clear to any sensible person.

In the currently tense international situation, the Soviet Union lays great store by the association of non-aligned countries, believing it to be a major political force in the struggle for peace and against imperialism. It renders invariable support to the NAM's anti-war and anti-imperialist activities, for it is aware that the main elements of the system of non-bloc international relations, which is the object of these activities, correspond to the structure of this system for which the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole have been working for so many years.

This is why, said the message of greetings addressed by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR to the Delhi non-aligned summit (March 1983), the efforts of the non-aligned movement towards peace and the security of nations, towards ending the arms race and starting disarmament, towards restructuring international economic relations on fair and democratic principles, and effecting complete and all-round decolonization have always enjoyed enthusiastic support in the Soviet Union. This view is also held by the other countries of the socialist community.

The solidarity of the socialist and non-aligned countries could not be firm, of course, if it were like one-way traffic. This solidarity is needed not only by the non-aligned. For the Soviet Union, cooperation with them and support on their part are no less important. "They are to us friends and partners in the struggle for stable peace and for better, just relations among the peoples," Mikhail Gorbachev said.

One can hardly argue the statement by Mengistu Haile Mariam, the leader of non-aligned Ethiopia, that the NAM and the socialist countries have common goals in the struggle for freedom, equality, peace, prosperity, justice and democracy. It is only natural, he believes, that one side should back up the other.

Mutual support of the socialist and non-aligned countries is the surest way to the further substantial increase of their weight in the balance of world forces, to an effective solution of the cardinal problems of today for their common benefit. "The alliance of the forces of social progress and national liberation is a guarantee of a better future for mankind," says the Programme of the CPSU.

The USSR and other socialist countries respect the choice of non-alignment by the emergent states. Provisions to this effect have been made in the treaties of friendship and cooperation signed by the USSR with India, Syria, Iraq, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, the Congo and some other NAM members.

The non-aligned countries, which signed these treaties, have seen for themselves that cooperation with the Soviet Union is a practical embodiment of the progressive principles which they would like to be established in the new international economic order. In fact, in their relations with the Soviet Union, which has never had colonies, there has never been any "old order" to restructure. "The Soviet Union," says the Programme of the CPSU, "is building its relations with those countries on the basis of strict respect for their independence and equality, and supports the struggle of those countries against the neo-colonialist policy of imperialism, against the survivals of colonialism, and for peace and universal security."

Naturally, the Soviet Union maintains closest cooperation with the non-aligned socialist and socialist-oriented countries. However, the CPSU Programme says, "Relations between the Soviet Union and newly-free countries have demonstrated that there also exists a realistic basis for cooperation with those young states that are following the capitalist road of development. This basis consists in a common interest in safeguarding peace,

strengthening international security and ending the arms race; in a sharpening contradiction between the interests of the peoples and the imperialist policy of diktat and expansion; and in an understanding by young states of the fact that political and economic ties with the Soviet Union help to strengthen their independence."

Soviet-Indian relations show clearly the great significance of Soviet political and economic assistance to non-aligned countries. Friendship and cooperation between non-aligned India and the Soviet Union has always helped India in the struggle against world imperialism.

The years of independence are for India the years of its non-alignment with blocs and growing friendship with the Soviet Union. Soviet-Indian friendship has a long history. The two countries cooperate practically in every field of politics and the economy. And whenever India came up against the imperialists' opposition in pursuing its policy of peace and economic development, it has always enjoyed Soviet support. Suffice it to recall, for instance, how the Bhilai steel plant, the first project of India's metal industry, was built.

The logical outcome of the stable growth of friendly Soviet-Indian relations was the signing of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation in 1971. Article 4 of the Treaty recognizes India's non-alignment policy to be "an important factor for maintaining world peace and international security and for lessening tensions in the world". So the Soviet-Indian treaty, far from contradicting this policy, is quite compatible with it and supports it.

It is often asked in the world, what is the cause of the enviably stable Soviet-Indian friendship? The answer is easy: it is complete understanding on the main problems affecting both countries and the whole world. The goals of the USSR's policy coincide with those of India: both countries oppose colonialism and imperialist wars of aggression, and work for peace and a better international climate. Indian leaders have emphasized on many occasions that both countries promote peaceful coexistence and mutually beneficial relations, and strive to carry out the behests of the founders of the two states regarding

the building of a world without exploitation and hunger, a world in which all people and nations would be equal.

The relations of warm friendship and many-sided cooperation with India are highly valued in the Soviet Union. These relations benefit both countries and facilitate the solution of international problems in Asia and the rest of the world.

Soviet political, material and moral support to non-aligned and other developing countries is not based on altruism. It has a more solid basis—the USSR and these countries pursue common or similar objectives on the international scene. It is well known and remembered in the Soviet Union that together with the peoples of the socialist countries, the peoples of Asian, African and Latin American states are a major contingent of the fighters for national liberation, progress and world peace.

The interests of the socialist and non-aligned countries cannot, of course coincide fully and there is difference of opinion on some issues. This also occurs in the relations among non-aligned countries themselves, and in any other group of countries. Such differences are understandable. The Soviet Union also realizes that not all NAM positions coincide with, or are close to, its own views, that differences on some issues are quite big.

Experience shows, however, that the difference of opinion is not the main thing in the relations between the socialist and non-aligned countries. In these relations there is nothing resembling the irreconcilable conflict of interests which divides the non-aligned movement and the capitalist world. Certain differences in the positions of the socialist and non-aligned countries do not prevent them from supporting each other in the main areas of the struggle for peace, freedom and progress. "The interaction of those countries with socialist states," says the Programme of the CPSU, "is vastly important for strengthening the independence of the peoples, improving international relations and preserving peace."

This interaction is most vivid in the United Nations and at international conferences where the delegations of the USSR and other socialist states and the non-aligned countries jointly secure the adoption of important deci-

sions on serious international matters, be it problems of peace, disarmament, problems of southern Africa or the Middle East, or those involved in restructuring international economic relations.

This is seen, for example, from the report submitted by the US Department of State to Congress in February 1984, which stated that at the 38th Session of the UN General Assembly in 80 per cent of the cases the non-aligned countries voted with the socialist countries and only in 20 per cent of the cases with the West. At the 39th Session this proportion changed even more, and not in the USA's favour. On the average, the developing countries voted with the USA only in 12.8 per cent of the cases; and the larger non-aligned countries, even more seldom (Algeria, 4.5 per cent; India, 6.5 per cent). At the same time, the non-aligned countries acted at one with the socialist states more often than not. For instance, they were among the 150 countries which voted for the USSR-proposed resolution on preventing the militarization of outer space, and did not back up the USA which was against that resolution and found itself practically in isolation.

The non-aligned and socialist states, naturally, hold different views on certain issues. The Soviet Union cannot agree, for instance, with the assessments and demands stemming from the concepts of "rich and poor nations" and "equidistance".

The USSR believes that there is no "North-South" problem, but that there is the "imperialist West and developing South" problem; that there is no "rich and poor nations" problem, but that there is the problem of "rich imperialist powers and poor developing countries". This is a substantial specification, for a correct and fair political assessment of Western economic aid to young states depends on it.

The Soviet Union believes it is unfair to approach itself and the West in the same way. Why? Because the Soviet people had no part at all in the plunder and exploitation of the colonies, and they have every reason to get offended by being lumped in the same category together with colonialist and neocolonialist plunderers.

One cannot fail to see that the increased aggressiveness of US policy with regard to the Soviet Union and the growth of international tensions greatly limit the possibilities of Soviet economic aid to developing countries. The Soviet people are compelled to spend a good deal of efforts and means on building up their defence might and preventing nuclear catastrophe which can bring incalculable losses and damage to all nations.

And if, after all, the Soviet Union gives whatever disinterested economic assistance it can to the young states, how can it be compared with Western aid rendered as a compensation for the colonialist and neocolonialist plunder? Soviet assistance is significant in that it has enabled Egypt, India and many other newly-free states to stand on their own feet and grow stronger economically. Thanks to Soviet aid they can speak with the West more confidently and resolutely demand its compliance with their legitimate claims.

The volume of Soviet economic aid to newly-free countries is not so small. Considering its share in the Soviet GNP, it even exceeds the corresponding GNP share of countries like the United States, Britain and France. And it keeps growing. In 1976-1980, total Soviet aid to developing countries increased by 70 per cent and amounted to about 30,000 million roubles, or 1 per cent of the Soviet GNP. In 1982, this sum reached 8,500 million roubles, or 1.27 per cent of the GNP. The Soviet Union also renders developing countries aid without compensation, grants them credits on easy terms, and reduces payment for the technical assistance extended by Soviet experts and for aid in training these countries' national personnel. In 1983, the USSR granted economic and technical aid to 70 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

So far, the USSR cannot yet fully meet the developing countries' requirements and helps them to the extent it can afford to. But the obvious fact is that the sooner the imperialist warmongers sober up, international tensions relax, the arms race stops and peace becomes stable, the more disinterested aid the Soviet Union will render to the newly-free countries in their anti-imperialist struggle.

for economic liberation and advancement.

Experience has shown that the problem of safeguarding peace becomes increasingly interrelated with problems of newly-free countries' development and those related to the complete elimination of all consequences of colonialism in international political and economic relations. The socialist countries regard with understanding the plight of the non-aligned and other developing countries and their fair demands advanced in connection with the catastrophic increase of their debts to the imperialist powers and monopolies. Most important in these conditions is to prevent the neocolonialists from exploiting these debts for establishing political domination. The non-aligned countries cannot fail to recognize that the Soviet Union, like other countries of the socialist community, has always advocated the speediest elimination of the neocolonialist system of exploiting developing countries, and the solution of financial and other acute problems of international economic relations with due account of their interests. It has always promoted the economic security of states and the establishment of a really new, fair and democratic international economic order.

It is safe to say that the NAM has from the outset had allies in the world and itself is an ally of the anti-imperialist forces, and actually part of these forces. Moreover, the position of the non-aligned countries in the world economy and politics and their objective economic and political interests as regards the main aspects of international economic and political relations are a source of their struggle with the imperialist powers, and of closer relations with the socialist states, whether the imperialists and some leaders of non-aligned countries like it or not, and no matter if this is registered in NAM documents. It is the vital interests of the non-aligned countries that create the objective necessity for cooperation between them and the socialist states in solving pressing international problems. The anti-imperialist and anti-militaristic union of the NAM and the socialist world is an objective historical necessity. Those who deny this are trying to deny the law-governed historical trends.

## 2. The NAM Is Growing Stronger

As one compares the impact of world tensions and hard economic conditions on the policy of individual non-aligned countries and on the NAM as a whole, one will see that the movement has been more stable and consistent in its political activity than many of its members. While a number of non-aligned countries have yielded to the pressure of circumstances and Western threats and abandoned their anti-imperialist positions to adopt the "genuine non-alignment" concept promoted by the imperialists, the NAM as a whole has maintained its anti-imperialist thrust.

However, some decisions adopted by the NAM meetings in the late 1970s and early 1980s contained occasional "equidistant" ideas, the demands on the West have grown more vague and are now more seldom addressed directly to the USA and other imperialist powers, and the number of reservations to decisions has increased. Considering the NAM's motley composition, it can hardly be otherwise. But the spirit of all non-aligned meetings and conferences held in these years and the content of the jointly adopted documents confirm that in the new conditions, too, the anti-war and anti-imperialist potential of the movement remains great.

The reason for this is clear enough. Prevailing at the meetings are, as a rule, the tendencies which unite the non-aligned countries, not those which divide them. Such cementing trends have been, and continue to be, the anti-war drive and anti-imperialism. Precisely they meet the vital interests of former colonies and semi-colonies united in the non-aligned movement. A rare NAM country would venture to singlehandedly defend its interests against the West, but acting together, supporting each other (though some of them prefer to hide behind others' backs), the non-aligned countries acquire strength and courage for anti-imperialist action.

That Western diplomacy and propaganda were unable to hide dissatisfaction with the outcome of the 1983 Delhi non-aligned summit is good evidence that the NAM remains firmly anti-imperialist and active even in the



conditions of world tensions. Right after the close of the conference the US Department of State issued an official statement saying that the final declaration of the conference was in many respects "an unbalanced and polemical document", which, allegedly, did not reflect the principles of non-alignment. But what did not suit Washington more than anything else were "the unfair attacks on the United States" and the absence of criticism of the Soviet Union!'<sup>9</sup>

There can hardly be more explicit admission of the defeat by US spokesmen of "genuine non-alignment" or "equidistance". The Americans themselves expressed how greatly their view of justice and the non-alignment principles differed from the views of the non-aligned countries. Meanwhile the British *Financial Times* wrote that the declaration, which had been drawn up in Delhi by representatives of almost 100 developing countries, dashed all hopes of the West that the movement would become more neutral towards the United States.

Considering that these hopes were associated with the convocation of the conference precisely in Delhi, the statement made by the *Financial Times* is even more significant, for it shows that the NAM's anti-imperialist attitudes do not depend on whether non-aligned summit conferences are held in Belgrade, Cairo, Lusaka, Alger, Colombo, Havana, Delhi, or in any other capital. These countries adopt anti-American and anti-imperialist decisions also in New York, at the meetings of their Coordinating Bureau. There is a great deal of continuity between non-aligned meetings, all of which are marked by anti-imperialism wherever they are held, because it has always been endemic to the national liberation movement.

Of great theoretical and political significance in this context is the conclusion which the non-aligned countries made jointly at the 1983 Delhi Conference despite the worsening of Soviet-American relations and despite the assertions of US propagandists and politicians that the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America was caused primarily by the East-West conflict and "vicious plottings of Moscow". In its Politi-

cal Declaration the conference said: "The attempt to erroneously characterize the struggles of peoples for independence and human dignity as falling within the context of East-West confrontation denies them the right to determine their own destiny and realize their legitimate aspirations."<sup>20</sup>

Fidel Castro and the leaders of delegations of other countries illustrated by historical examples that the national liberation struggle had fermented for decades and the responsibility for the explosive situation in Central America, the Caribbean and other regions rested with the United States.

The summit conferences in Havana and Delhi and the conferences of foreign ministers of non-aligned countries held in Delhi in 1981 and in Luanda in September 1985, reaffirmed the decisions of previous non-aligned meetings and conferences on issues of war and peace and on complete and all-round decolonization. All the resolutions and declarations of the conferences express the non-aligned countries' profound concern for the growth of extremely dangerous tendencies in international relations, the spiraling arms race, the nuclear arms race in the first place, and the grave economic condition of the young states. The conferences held in the early 1980s did not merely state facts, but clearly defined their position in assessing them. Moreover, in search for a way out of the difficult situation, they proposed a number of possible solutions which were not limited to the national liberation zone, but concerned the whole world.

Much attention was given to these problems at the Havana Summit Conference in 1979. The further worsening of international relations induced the ministerial non-aligned conference, held in Delhi in February 1981, to appeal to all nations "to earnestly work for the avoidance of war and the consolidation of international peace and security".<sup>21</sup>

In that situation the non-aligned countries, striving to reverse the slide down of humanity towards catastrophe, and determined together to protect their political and economic interests, held their next conference in Delhi in 1983, at which they issued a message to the

heads of state and government of all countries. In the message they called on the great powers to start talks "to reach agreement on various disarmament measures and to find a way out of the deepening economic crisis which threatens all of us". The Delhi Message urged the countries possessing nuclear weapons "to adopt urgent and practical measures for the prevention of nuclear war ... agree on an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in any circumstances and to stop further production and deployment of nuclear weapons".<sup>22</sup>

Most active in international affairs, the NAM advanced ever broader initiatives to end the arms race, prevent nuclear war and ensure international security. The comprehensive disarmament programme it proposed has been made a major concrete component of the Political Declarations adopted at the summit and ministerial conferences. These pressing problems were given much prominence in the final documents of the non-aligned ministerial conference held in Luanda in September 1985.

As regards disarmament and security issues, the conference said, the NAM is firmly convinced that there is a close interrelationship between the relaxation of world tensions, peaceful settlement of disputes, disarmament, safeguarding of peace, respect for the right of the peoples to free self-determination and national independence on the one hand and their social and economic development on the other. The common awareness of this interrelationship in the present situation, tense as it is, is a major factor affecting the non-aligned movement, its activities and positions.

The Luanda ministerial conference showed that the efforts to avert global nuclear catastrophe, end the arms race and ensure detente and peaceful coexistence are given top priority in the NAM's activity. The attending foreign ministers reaffirmed in their Political Declaration the NAM's previous positions and advanced several new proposals. They spoke for a limitation and reduction of the military activities of the great powers and blocs outside their frontiers, and for a gradual military separa-

tion of the great powers and their military alliances in various parts of the world. The conference stressed that world peace and security could be guaranteed only through general and complete disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, under effective international control, and proposed the convocation of the third special session of the UN General Assembly on disarmament. It also spoke for holding Soviet-American talks on all problems related to the cessation of the arms race.

Even a cursory review of the proposals and appeals issued by recent NAM meetings will show they have much in common with the positions of the peace-loving Soviet Union and are far removed from US positions. One has merely to compare the unconcealed aggressiveness of the United States with the well-known Soviet peace proposals to see to whom the Luanda Conference addressed its demand that a joint agreement be reached without delay on banning the testing of all types of nuclear arms everywhere and for all time, and, before such an agreement is reached, that a moratorium be imposed on all nuclear tests and on the manufacture and deployment of nuclear weapons. This is true also of the appeal to all nuclear powers to assume a pledge not to be the first to use nuclear arms and provide guarantees to that effect.

Obviously anti-American were the sharp protest voiced at the Luanda Conference against the militarization of outer space through the introduction of new technologies, and the conclusion made by its delegates that reliance on strategic defence presents a threat of increasing, rather than lessening, instability in the world—instability caused by the danger of mutual destruction and leading to an unprecedented escalation of the nuclear arms race. The hope, expressed at the conference, that Soviet-American talks would lead to effective understandings on preventing an arms race in outer space, ending it on Earth and ultimately eliminating it completely and everywhere, is viewed as rejection of Washington's arguments in defence of its Star Wars plans.

The NAM continues to oppose, directly or in a slightly disguised manner, the policy of the USA and other imper-

ialist powers who facilitate the nuclear armament of Israel and South Africa, and demands a dismantling of US military bases on Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean and in Cuba. The NAM countries are vigilant against US aggressive plans with regard to Nicaragua, and Washington's "constructive engagement" of Israel and South Africa. On the other hand, the NAM continues to support the Palestinian people, the peoples of Namibia and South Africa and also the Front Line States in the south of Africa attacked now and again by Pretoria's racists.

Of great significance in this respect is the sharply negative position of the Delhi Conference in regard to the US government's intention to make the granting of independence to Namibia conditional on the withdrawal of the contingent of Cuban troops from Angola. The delegates to the Delhi Conference "most categorically rejected the linkage or parallelism being drawn by the United States Administration between the independence of Namibia and the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. This continued insistence constitutes an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of the People's Republic of Angola."<sup>23</sup> The ministerial conference in Luanda confirmed this stance and rejected all attempts to distract attention from the central issue of Namibia's decolonization by presenting the issue in the context of East-West confrontation to the prejudice of the legitimate aspirations of the Namibian people for self-determination, freedom and national independence.

Of no smaller significance is the confirmation by the Delhi Conference of the fact that the non-aligned countries interact with other peace- and freedom-loving forces in the struggle against "forces which are seeking to perpetuate unequal relations and privileges".<sup>24</sup>

In the Political Declaration the conference stated with satisfaction: "The non-aligned and other developing countries, national liberation movements and democratic peace- and freedom-loving forces throughout the world are playing an active role in the struggle for peace, universal detente and the general progress of the world."<sup>25</sup>

The conference spoke highly of the effective solidarity

of all states and forces supporting the struggle of the Palestinian people and the Arab nation, including the support rendered by the socialist countries. In the face of brazen intimidations by the South African racists, it again appealed to all peace-loving countries of the world to render utmost diplomatic, political and material aid to Mozambique, Zimbabwe and other Front-Line States in the south of Africa in order to heighten their defence capability. Meanwhile the ministerial conference in Luanda urged all states "to render increased material, financial, political, diplomatic and military assistance to the legitimate armed struggle waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of SWAPO".

So, despite all attempts by the West to isolate and weaken the NAM by getting it to accept "genuine non-alignment" without enemies or allies, the movement reaffirmed at its latest conferences that it not only needed allies but pointed out whom it considered to be its allies and who were its enemies.

The growing aggressiveness of imperialism and increased world tensions have not stopped the profound historical process of scrapping the colonial legacy, the process involving all non-aligned countries. In the new conditions, the movement carries on the struggle for economic decolonization, a radical restructuring of old international economic relations and for a new international economic order and a new international order in information and communications.

All the non-aligned meetings and conferences held in recent years have noted, however, that the opposition of the imperialist powers and monopolies has brought that effort to a deadlock. To break the deadlock and revive the global talks on establishing a new international economic order, the 1983 Delhi Conference proposed that the talks be held by in two stages, and advanced a programme of urgent measures of primary significance for the developing countries (currency and finance, trade, power engineering, agriculture, etc.). It proposed, in particular, the establishment of a new, fair and universal international monetary system and a convocation of an international monetary conference on development

problems to be attended by all countries. Simultaneously, it resolutely rejected the proposals made by the Western powers, the USA above all, that the international monetary system be transferred to private hands.

The non-aligned countries pin great hopes on a radical reform of this system, expecting it to help them solve the problems posed by their foreign debts and those involved in economic development. India has exerted a good deal of effort to achieve a convocation of such a conference. However, as the Luanda ministerial conference noted in 1985, no progress has been made in taking urgent measures to carry out the programme (including monetary measures), and the NAM is yet to overcome the strong resistance of the West on this path.

In the situation when decolonization of international economic relations is being sabotaged by the imperialist powers and monopolies, the NAM has put a greater emphasis on expanding economic cooperation among its member countries, on their collective self-reliance. In elaboration of the decisions taken at previous conferences, the 1983 Delhi Conference adopted a special declaration on the issue, in which it stressed its anti-imperialist character. The declaration says, in particular, that non-aligned and other developing countries have set out to expand their economic cooperation "to achieve the goal of economic, social and cultural decolonization and to reduce the vulnerability of our economies to effects of adverse international economic trends and to outside pressures"<sup>26</sup>

Thus it reaffirmed that opposition to neocolonialism, the social and economic development of newly-free states and the changes in economic cooperation among them were all interlinked. And, to dot their "i's" and cross their "t's", the ministers and heads of delegation of non-aligned countries reiterated at their New York meeting in October 1984 that "peace and development were closely inter-related" and that "stable global development and viable international order require the halting of the arms race, followed by urgent disarmament measures that will release sorely needed resources for development"<sup>27</sup>

So, the aggressive course of the present US Administration does not enjoy support or understanding in the NAM. Nor do the attempts of ex- and neocolonialists to keep exploiting newly-free countries. Therefore neither the world tensions nor the economic crisis could crumble the foundation of solidarity among the non-aligned countries and undermine the community of the non-aligned countries' vital interests which remain anti-imperialist and constitute the foundation on which their solidarity rests.

This foundation has proved strong enough for the NAM to remain a viable institution in the system of international relations. After it gained ground during the detente of the 1970s and its mechanism was brought into play, neither the change in the international situation, nor the pressure from the West, nor occasional failures in cooperation among the NAM countries could stop its advancement. So it has lived on and developed despite the complicated international situation in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

This is all the more significant, if one recalls that the African and Arab countries, which make up the majority in the NAM, have failed in the new conditions to retain unity in their not so large regional organizations—the OAU and the Arab League—and to ensure their smooth operation. Evidently the rigid provisions of the OAU and the Arab League charters prevailed for some period over the common interests of their member countries, while in the NAM, which has no such rigid norms, all African and Arab states, despite some differences among them, could come to terms on many issues of common interest. This perhaps accounts for the fact that, as distinct from the OAU and Arab League, not a single summit or ministerial conference was wrecked. The only minor setbacks were that the convocation of the seventh non-aligned summit was delayed for six months, and the date of holding the eighth conference was not decided on for a long period of time.

It is symptomatic that only in the 1980s was the Republic of India for the first time chosen as the NAM's host country according to the common wish of the non-aligned countries. It was no coincidence, of course, that



the non-aligned countries entrusted India with the leadership of the movement in so difficult a time. This country, the largest among them, has won their trust by its wise and freedom-loving policy all through the years of its independent development.

And, last but not least, the obviously greater interest displayed by newly-free countries in participating in this movement in the present conditions is a sign of the increased international prestige of the NAM and the objective need for its existence. Not a single NAM country has followed the example of Burma, which left the NAM in 1979. On the contrary, the number of its members notably increased after the 1979 conference in Havana.

Another significant development is that in recent time more Latin American countries, intent on dissociating themselves from the United States and ending their economic and political dependence on Washington, tend to join the movement. In 1982, this tendency increased under the impact of the Anglo-Argentinian conflict over the Falkland Islands (Malvinas), and now the choice between remaining in alliance with Washington or becoming dissociated from it, which has long since confronted Latin America, is easier to make, and is obviously being made in favour of non-alignment.

Another new element in extending the NAM's composition is that after it was joined by three European countries, most Asian and Latin American countries, and all the newly-free countries of Africa, it reached the frontiers of Oceania.

The peoples and governments of Oceania, which have recently freed themselves from colonial regimes, seek ways of strengthening their international positions by joining the non-aligned movement. The first country from Oceania to join the NAM was the Republic of Vanuatu (the New Hebrides in the Pacific which had been a joint domain of Britain and France), which became independent in 1980. The republic was admitted at its request to the NAM as full-fledged member at the Delhi Conference. Some other young states in Oceania are on their way to becoming NAM members. For instance, Papua New Guinea, which in 1981 began to send its

delegates to non-aligned meetings as guests, participated in the Delhi Conference in the higher status of observer.

Today, the NAM numbers 101 full members, and is thus becoming one of the largest international associations in the world, which keeps expanding.

### **3. The Harare Conference—A Case for New Political Thinking**

In late August and early September 1986, the attention of the governments and public of the world was focused on Harare, the capital of Zimbabwe, a young state in southern Africa and the host country for a major international forum of the year—the Eighth Non-Aligned Summit Conference. It was attended by the leaders and plenipotentiaries of 98 countries of Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe and Oceania, and of two national liberation organizations, the PLO and SWAPO, which are full members of the movement. Among the conference participants were numerous observers and guests. For the first time the status of observer was given to the national liberation organization of New Caledonia; and the guest status, to Australia, Greece, Mongolia, the Secretariat of the Commonwealth of Nations, and to several regional organizations of developing countries.

The time and place of the convocation, and the current international situation added much to the significance of the Harare Conference. How would the non-aligned countries, that is, nearly two-thirds of all countries in the world, respond to the war and peace issues, and problems of economic growth which have become so acute today; and how would they behave in the tense atmosphere of the area which is only a stone's throw from the racist regime of South Africa? These questions were of concern not only to the two thousand newsmen who had arrived in Harare to cover the conference.

In the situation of grave international contradictions, the threat of a nuclear holocaust, the debt bondage, uncompleted decolonization, power politics and economic pressure by the neocolonialists, the representatives of non-aligned nations gathered in Harare to chart a path

to political, military and economic security and to find ways of solving the problems confronting them. Many of these countries, and the conference as a whole, were again faced with the choice of a position: for what, with whom and against whom they would fight, while adhering to the principle of non-alignment with blocs.

The decisions were prompted by the world developments preceding the conference. The reference is, above all, to the events (or rather actions by the USSR on the one hand and the USA on the other) which have a direct bearing on the solution of the most burning issue of our time—the issue of peace and security.

The strategic peace moves made by the USSR in 1986, such as the programme of a phased elimination of nuclear arms by the year 2000, and the principles of setting up an all-embracing system of international security were a shot in the arm for the non-aligned movement in its peace efforts. Most convincing for the non-aligned nations were the USSR's practical moves which demonstrated its peacefulness and a new approach to tackling the most acute problems of disarmament and security. Among them was the extension of the unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions announced a month before the opening of the conference.

Taking this major practical step aimed at finally securing a tangible breakthrough in halting the arms race, Mikhail Gorbachev wrote in his message of greeting to the Harare Conference, we believe that "people in all countries, politicians and the participants in the conference would correctly assess the silence on the Soviet nuclear proving-grounds and would assist in making it so that the test nuclear blasts would stop rumbling on the Earth in general".<sup>28</sup>

It has become even more obvious that, by contrast with major peace initiatives and practical moves by the Soviet Union which are fully consonant with the interests of the peoples, the policy and practical actions of the United States and some of its closest allies run counter to these interests.

The USA and its allies tried in vain to induce the non-aligned countries to concentrate on regional problems

and conflicts, especially on the "Afghan" and "Kampuchean" issues, and so distract them from global war and peace issues which are quite painful for the militarists. Washington's refusal to follow the Soviet example, the continuing nuclear tests in the United States, the US aggression, with Britain's support, against Libya in the spring of 1986, the ostensible allocation by the USA of \$100 million for military aid to Nicaraguan contras, the open US interference in the domestic affairs of Angola during many years, the frustration of the Paris international conference on disarmament and development in the summer of 1986, refusal to meet the fair demands of the peoples for all-embracing sanctions against the racist regime of South Africa, and "constructive engagement" with it, which helps preserve the regime and destabilizes the Front-Line States—all this provided objective conditions in which the historical contradictions between the non-aligned nations on the one hand, and militarism and imperialism on the other, were laid open even before the Harare Conference. It is not "Moscow's schemings", but US imperialism with its neoglobalist ambitions that has caused the obvious spread of anti-American sentiments in the non-aligned movement in recent years.

Aware that US political positions in the non-aligned countries are tottering, President Reagan did not even venture to send a message of greetings to the Harare Conference, as he had done when the Delhi Conference was held in 1983. Instead of greeting the Harare Conference, Washington put stronger financial and economic pressure on its participants, "punishing" the disobedient. The US Administration ostentatiously announced the suspension of economic aid to Zimbabwe to the tune of \$13.5 million in 1986 and \$21 million in 1987, right after Robert Mugabe, Zimbabwe's Prime Minister, made the opening speech at the conference which Washington did not like. The State Department followed up with qualifying the conference and the documents it discussed as "a litany of arbitrary and unfounded charges against US foreign policy".

It was not by chance that when the Harare Conference started the British government announced its decision to

limit the entry to Britain of people from India and some other developing countries. In this way Britain made it perfectly clear that the non-aligned countries, which have assumed an active position with regard to eliminating the Pretoria regime, should pay a price for their attitude to the racists of South Africa, the *Hindustan Times* wrote in those days.

The racists, too, set out to intimidate the Front-Line and other non-aligned countries, as they demanded that assistance be stopped to the fighters for the freedom of Namibia and against the apartheid regime of South Africa. The racists went so far as to threaten use of armed force to disrupt the convocation of the conference at Harare, which is not very far from South Africa. In the United States, Britain and South Africa every means was used, including diplomacy, science and the press, to intimidate the non-aligned nations, especially those in southern Africa, by threatening them with heavy economic consequences should they insist on sanctions against South Africa with which America and Britain are bound by a multitude of trade and economic ties.

To be sure, the massive pressure and threats, as well as the immense debt, which has mounted up due to the neocolonialists, could not but influence some of the non-aligned countries, and they were forced to demonstrate, even before the conference, that they were determined to preserve close ties with the West at any cost.

But that was one of the reasons why the non-aligned countries wanted to hold their conference. Few of them would dare today to come out singlehanded against the policy of the militarists, imperialists and neocolonialists and their accomplices. Jointly, however, they did so. In this respect the Harare non-aligned summit differed considerably from the preceding ones.

Even the first brief survey of its work and the documents it adopted revealed its specific features.

Peace, independence, disarmament and development are known to have been the goals of the non-aligned movement from the outset. The declaration adopted at the conference on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the NAM says in part: "At twenty-five today, rich in

wisdom and moral strength, our movement is better armed to meet these challenges and to carry out its historical mission of seeking the establishment of a new, just and democratic world order with greater determination and resilience." There is perhaps enough reason to state that in Harare the non-aligned countries became more aware of this.

A statement made long ago by Josip Broz Tito, who together with other outstanding leaders—Jawaharlal Nehru, Gamal Abdel Nasser, Ahmed Sukarno and Kwame Nkrumah—materialized the fruitful idea of non-alignment into one of the largest and most authoritative international associations, has been confirmed and elaborated on. Addressing the Third Non-Aligned Summit Conference in Lusaka, Zambia, in 1970, Tito said: "Any idea of exclusiveness, of some special right or conviction that useful suggestions and advice come only from us, are alien to us."<sup>29</sup>

Though in a few speeches at the conference and in some of its final documents one still feels a wish to assess the international situation in the old way, proceeding from the idea of "equal responsibility of the two super-powers for world tensions and the nuclear arms race", the Harare Conference on the whole advanced towards revising the untenable thesis of "genuine non-alignment". Ever more non-aligned countries are beginning to "see the light" and their choice of a place in the international arena is more often determined after they find out who is who in this troubled world today.

This interdependence is very significant because for the first time in history of the movement its summit conference openly and unanimously recognized that the position of peace adhered to by the non-aligned countries was close to that of the Soviet Union. In the Political Declaration the Harare Conference welcomed with satisfaction the broad and timely programme of phased nuclear disarmament proposed recently by the Soviet Union. The Declaration also stressed that the goals and priorities of this programme largely coincide with the position of the non-aligned countries. The conference welcomed the extension by the USSR of its unilateral moratorium on

nuclear weapons tests until January 1, 1987, and urged the United States to follow suit.

The main issues debated at Harare included ways and means of stopping the slide down to a nuclear conflict and saving the world and civilization. "Peace is one of the most sacred duties of our movement... The nightmare threatening the entire human race must cease," Fidel Castro said at Harare, expressing the sentiments of all who attended the conference. Its final documents formulated their constructive stand on all the major issues of disarmament and peace—from the establishment of nuclear-free zones on Earth to non-militarization of outer space.

To safeguard peace and prevent nuclear war is the "chief task of our time", says the Harare Appeal addressed to the President of the United States and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. "We call upon the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and on all the other nuclear powers to take urgent measures to prevent nuclear war," the Appeal says.

The conference examined the most acute regional problems, above all those of southern Africa, Central America and the Middle East, in the context of stepping up efforts to ease international tensions. What is more, the charges brought up against the imperialists at the conference made it a trial of imperialism. "The international situation has greatly deteriorated because of the incessant attempts by the forces of colonialism and imperialism to impose their hegemony on the world," said Abdel Halim Khaddam, Vice President of Syria. This clear idea was expressed one way or another by many other heads of delegation and in the final documents.

Strong criticism was levelled at the United States and its "international hooliganism", as its policy of aggression and threats was described by Robert Mugabe in his speech. According to the French *Le Monde*, in many speeches at the conference and in its resolutions "the USA is seen as the main defendant", and final documents of the conference are "much tougher towards the USA than documents of past conferences ever were". So the

Western press only had to count the increase in the instances of the negative mention of the USA and strong censure of its policy vis-à-vis the Third World, and state that the documents not only said nothing of the sort about the USSR but that "the USSR received two certificates of merit: one for its disarmament programme and the other for the extension of the unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions" (*Le Monde*).

The conference responded to the aggressive acts, threats and pressure on the part of the imperialists and their accomplices by issuing the Harare Declaration on Stepping Up Joint Action, in which the non-aligned countries have pledged themselves "to safeguard and strengthen the present historical trend for the national political as well as the economic liberation of countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions against the growing threats of aggression and use of force". Moreover, they declared in a joint resolution that "in the event of a non-aligned country being subjected to threat of the use of force or of aggression, or subject to measures applied under pressure destined to prevent the full, free and effective exercise of its sovereign rights, such measures should be considered as being directed against the non-aligned countries as a whole". In this case all the non-aligned nations should come to its aid at its request.

In a special statement the conference strongly denounced the repeated acts of aggression committed by the USA against Libya in 1986, qualifying them as state terrorism. It urged the United States to immediately offer full compensation to Libya for the human losses and material damage it had suffered, and to lift the economic boycott against Libya.<sup>30</sup>

A significant point to note is that practical measures to counter imperialism were proposed at the conference. Muammar Qaddafi, for instance, called for breaking relations with the USA, Britain, Israel and South Africa and building an international front to counter imperialism, and even spoke of readiness to form "international armed forces to combat US interests on all continents". The President of Benin pointed out in his speech the



danger of Star Wars and demanded that the non-aligned and other countries of the Third World increase the prices of the raw materials used for building up nuclear capabilities. Other considerations expressed at the conference show that the non-aligned nations are seeking new ways of using their possibilities in world politics.

These new and important developments were most clearly seen in that the Harare Conference noticeably specifies the traditional anti-colonial and anti-racist stance of the non-aligned movement on problems of southern Africa. Evidently, the entire association of non-aligned countries, which gathered for their regular meeting in a Front-Line State in the south of Africa, also became "front-line" for the time being. This being so, it was most sensitive to any aspect of the explosive situation in that region—to the events in South Africa, to the artificially delayed liberation of the people of Namibia, to the incessant armed raids of South African racists into Angola, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Botswana, and to the racists' support to the anti-government forces in Angola and Mozambique. According to the Indian newspaper *Tribune*, the Harare Conference has shown that the non-aligned movement is psychologically preparing to rebuff South Africa's aggression, and maintain peace and security in the region.

In the Special Declaration on Southern Africa, the conference has put it straight that the situation in the region is worsening mainly because the apartheid system is still there. It strongly denounced the policy of "constructive engagement" with that regime and expressed determination to speed up its utter liquidation.

The conference denounced "the insistence by the Reagan administration and the racist Pretoria regime on linking the independence of Namibia to the irrelevant and extraneous issue of the withdrawal of Cuban internationalist forces from Angola". The conference also demanded that independence be granted to Namibia without any further delay. The non-aligned countries at Harare continued to insist on imposing all-embracing and obligatory sanctions by the UN Security Council against South Africa in compliance with Chapter VII of the UN Charter

and declared that until the sanctions were imposed they would back up a series of practical economic measures against the South African regime and recommend them to the broad international community. We should begin introducing sanctions now, not waiting for coordinated international actions, Rajiv Gandhi said. If we start doing it now, this would give an impetus to the Western public.

The package of selective sanctions against South Africa the conference decided upon envisaged the prohibition of machinery and technology transfers to South Africa; an end to the export, sale or shipment of oil and oil products to South Africa; termination of capital investment in South Africa or Namibia and denial of loans to them; cessation of trade with South Africa; a ban on the import of farm produce, coal, uranium, iron, steel, etc. from South Africa; suspension of air and sea transport communication with South Africa, and so on. Some of the sanctions had been partially applied by a number of West European and other countries even before the Harare Conference. The conference decided to work for increasing the number of countries involved in measures against South Africa and extending the measures themselves. It set up a group of foreign ministers of eight non-aligned countries and instructed it to pay visits to the USA, Britain, the FRG and Japan to persuade their leaders to renounce their opposition to sanctions against South Africa.

The statement by Fidel Castro that Cuba was prepared to have its troops stationed in Angola "as long as apartheid exists in South Africa" evoked great reverberations at the conference. That statement was a response of Cuba and Angola to the categorical demand of the USA and South Africa that the Cuban internationalist force should leave Angola before independence was granted to Namibia. Fidel Castro said that by agreement with Angola a gradual withdrawal of 20,000 Cuban troops defending the strategic roads in southern Angola would start only after UN Resolution No. 435 on Namibia is implemented and the threat of aggression against Angola, the dirty war, and support to mercenaries in Angola are ended.

The rest of the Cuban contingent will be withdrawn when the sovereign governments of Angola and Cuba deem it necessary.

The call to form the joint armed forces of the non-aligned movement to defend the Front-Line States in the south of the African continent from aggression by South Africa sounded loud at the conference. This idea had been suggested earlier within the Organization of African Unity, including at the OAU Assembly in 1986. However, it was new to the non-aligned movement as a whole and was received at the time as hardly practicable. But the fact that it was suggested at Harare is a sign that within the movement the search has begun for ways of extending practical aid to the Front-Line States in ensuring their security and active role in international sanctions against South Africa.

The conference made a considerable headway in this respect by entirely backing the measures provided for in the statement issued at the OAU Assembly in 1986. The statement envisages the provision of resources needed by the Front-Line States to enhance their defence potential, aid to them for increasing their capability for removing the aftermaths of sabotage, economic blackmail and economic aggression by the racist regime<sup>31</sup> and the effects of sanctions against the regime. Describing this assistance in more specific terms, the Harare Conference adopted a decision on setting up a fund for resisting invasion, colonialism and apartheid. This was a major outcome of the conference.

The Fund is designed for building up the economic and financial capability of the Front-Line States to fight the apartheid regime in Pretoria, and to support the liberation movements in South Africa and Namibia. Its other mission is to assist the Front-Line States to enforce sanctions against South Africa and to cope with any retaliatory economic action by the racist regime. Provisions have also been made for practical measures to ensure in these countries security for their vital economic projects, the uninterrupted deliveries of oil and other power sources, smooth operation of transport and communications, and improvement of the situation caused by the shortage

of necessities. The conference appealed to the broad international community to contribute generously to the Fund. The Fund will be managed by a committee of 9 non-aligned countries: India (chairman), Zambia (vice chairman), Zimbabwe, Algeria, Nigeria, Congo, Yugoslavia, Peru and Argentina.

Thus, the plan of practical measures was devised at Harare not only for loosening the "death grip" of South Africa over the economies of Zimbabwe, Zambia and other Front-Line States, but also for bringing nearer the collapse of the racist regime in South Africa. The assessment of the Harare decisions in the *Hindustan Times* is significant in this context. Now, the paper stressed, the racist white minority regime in Pretoria should realize that Harare marked the beginning of the end for apartheid. One can well agree with the conclusion of the British *Guardian* that the Harare Conference marked a watershed in the confrontation between South Africa and the Western states backing it on the one hand, and the rest of the world community siding with Black Africa on the other.

The search for new ways of using the NAM's own resources, a new development at the Harare Conference, was seen in the third major set of problems debated at it, namely, economic problems.

As soon as they realized that the neocolonialists had set out to torpedo the North-South dialogue and would not agree to a fair restructuring of international economic relations, the non-aligned countries, gathered at Harare, concentrated on ways of extending trade and economic ties along the South-South line. Having thoroughly discussed their needs and possibilities, they did not limit themselves this time to adopting the economic declaration but decided to establish cooperation among themselves, while not renouncing the demand to resume the North-South dialogue. Their determination to act in this vein was seen in the unanimous backing of India's proposal on setting up in the framework of the movement a Standing Committee on economic cooperation at a ministerial level headed by the Chairman of the non-aligned movement.

The chief purpose of the Committee, says the relevant resolution, is to help expand cooperation and coordinated actions among the non-aligned and other developing countries. Its second main purpose is to revive the North-South dialogue. The more specific tasks are: to examine and coordinate the policies and programmes of non-aligned and other developing countries on international economic cooperation, specifically on monetary problems, debts, trade and development; and to elaborate the strategy and platform of non-aligned and other developing countries for future talks in the context of the North-South dialogue at various international meetings, including the United Nations.

It has been decided that the Committee of 22 ministers of non-aligned nations and three other developing countries having the observer status is to be elected for a term of three years. The Committee will include 10 members from Africa, 7 from Asia, 4 from Latin America and 1 from Europe. Decisions will be made by consensus, and all its meetings will be open.

In addition to this important organizational decision, an independent commission will be set up to study economic problems facing the countries of the "South" and to plan measures to lessen their dependence on the "North". Its elected chairman is Julius K. Nyerere, ex-President of Tanzania. The commission is expected to complete its job within two years. A ministerial non-aligned conference is planned to be held in 1987 in Pyongyang, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to discuss South-South cooperation.

All these facts indicate that a specific restructuring process in the economic area is under way in the association of non-aligned countries. The purpose, evidently, is not only to set new bodies in the association but to change the present situation and ultimately to solve the economic problems confronting the developing world.

All the non-aligned countries without exception have been affected by these problems which have grown extremely acute, especially the foreign debt problem. The speakers at the conference announced figures illustrating the total debt which has shot up in recent years to a

staggering \$1 trillion (1985). In 1985, for instance, Africa spent 32 per cent of its export revenues on repaying the debts, and Latin America had to pay 44 per cent. This was regarded as a "debt trap" set by the neocolonialists. "We are being exploited in ever more ruthless manner... The price we pay as neocolonies is much higher than the price we paid when we were just colonies"—this bitter conclusion made by Fidel Castro was shared by other delegates at the conference.

What is the way out? Various solutions were suggested.

Fidel Castro reiterated the need to eliminate foreign debts. "Mathematical analyses and serious reflections on this matter bring us to the conclusion that the third world countries' external debt is unpayable and uncollectable, it is politically impossible, economically impossible and morally impossible," he said. "Our countries are not debtors but creditors—capitalism's development was financed by the blood, the sweat and the wealth of the Asian, African and Latin American colonies... The world economy would be able to overcome the crisis only with the abolition of the debt and with the new international economic order..."

Peace, disarmament, the solution of the debt problem and creation of a new international economic order are all closely interrelated, stressed Fidel Castro. "Less than one-third of the annual spending wasted in the military field," he observed, "would be enough to cancel the debt and take on the cost of the new international economic order."

The Peruvian delegation again proposed that each debtor country should fix the share of its export revenues to be spent on clearing off debts. Peru has already fixed this share at 10 per cent. And, finally, the third proposal, made by President of Madagascar Didier Ratsiraka, is that a ten-year moratorium be imposed on debt repayment.

After a debate the conference decided on the Peruvian proposal. The Economic Declaration it adopted demands that the governments of the creditor and debtor countries start a political dialogue to find proper and mutually beneficial solutions to the problem of the foreign debt of

developing countries. As a practical measure it suggests that debt repayment be limited to a share of export revenues meeting the requirements of development and social and economic needs of each country.

This and many other provisions and demands of the Economic Declaration are in the nature of a compromise. Considering the great difference in the levels of social and economic development, not to mention different political orientations of the non-aligned countries, this approach is natural for any non-aligned meeting, because precisely this helps them to maintain unity. The anti-imperialism of the non-aligned association has its limits, and not only in economic matters. This is a reality of the movement's general democratic character.

It would be surprising if the Harare Conference solved all the problems on its agenda and settled all differences among its participants. Some of the disputes have remained unresolved. The conference failed, for instance, to reconcile Iran and Iraq, and the decision on the place of the next summit conference, due in 1989, had to be postponed until the non-aligned ministerial conference, which is to be held in 1988 in Cyprus. The members of the movement do not see eye with one another on the concept and policy of non-alignment, on the role of the movement in the international arena, and on the advisability of its further institutionalization, that is, the setting up of its secretariat and other executive bodies.

But these particulars do not belittle the generally positive outcome of the conference and the main result, that is, the non-aligned movement's unity in the main areas of activity. The NAM has taken a more active and specific stance in international affairs. Besides, the conference has confirmed the movement's relative stability as a major political force of our time, a force which is also anti-militarist and basically anti-imperialist. And this is evidently of no small importance for normalizing the currently fluid international situation.

The overwhelming majority of the delegates and the people in the countries they represented have responded with satisfaction to the outcome of the conference. It has instilled a good deal of hope in the newly-free states

and national liberation movements that their legitimate interests and goals will be protected. The non-aligned movement is today a more powerful force than it used to be before Harare, said Rajiv Gandhi.

All peace-loving countries have welcomed the fact that, at the conference, the non-aligned movement assumed a share of responsibility for removing the nuclear threat and improving the international climate. The recognition of the big international role played by the non-aligned movement gives confidence to its members, encouraging them to make it still more active. "The world needs us more than it did 25 years ago," said Rajiv Gandhi, confirming the opinion, prevalent in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other continents, that the non-aligned movement is a necessary progressive international force.

Doubts in the effectiveness of the Harare Conference and in the prospects of the movement as a whole, expressed in some non-aligned and Western countries, are drowned out by the wide positive response to the conference. The idea of setting up an alliance of "medium-size countries" instead of the non-aligned movement, expressed in Harare by the President of Nigeria, has remained unheeded. The attempts by the press in the United States, Britain and some other NATO countries to sap the movement's prestige and to pass over in silence the constructive results of the Harare Conference changed nothing in the objective state of affairs.

It is well understood in the non-aligned and other countries of the world that the effectiveness of the positive decisions adopted in Harare is yet to be proved in practice. The implementation of the decisions on southern Africa, where much depends on the non-aligned countries themselves, the Front-Line States above all, will be a serious test for the participants in the conference.

The stance assumed by Zimbabwe, and personally by Robert Mugabe, the new Chairman of the movement, is an example of staunchness and firm determination to implement the policy and decisions adopted at the non-aligned summit. Addressing a news conference early in October 1986, in New York, Robert Mugabe has this to say as he commented on the White House decision to



stop economic aid to Zimbabwe: "Let Washington remember that our independence and sovereignty, for which we were dying in battle, are not to be bargained about." A week later Mugabe stressed again that Zimbabwe was not going to beg Washington for alms and would criticize, well in keeping with its principled stand, the US policy in southern Africa and other regions.

Precisely this firm position of the non-aligned countries can compel even the forces "constructively engaged" with the racist regime of South Africa not to waste time and introduce sanctions against it. At any rate, it is safe to say that the decision made by the US Senate early in October 1986 to decline President Reagan's veto on additional sanctions against South Africa was influenced by the results of the Harare Conference of almost 100 countries. And in late October, 1986, the European Parliament demanded that the governments of 12 Common Market countries expand the sanctions.

The Harare resolutions open up new possibilities for the non-aligned countries also with regard to war and peace problems and economic development. These resolutions provide a sound basis for the active daily diplomatic work of these countries to overcome the difficulties and barriers in the way to their implementation. "We cannot sit idly by. We must demand solutions, we have a right to survive the dangers threatening us and to live with dignity and in peace... We represent the vast majority of humankind and we should not beg for our right to life. We must be able to take it." In these words Fidel Castro expressed the sentiments of most of the conference delegates which were registered in the Harare documents.

The conference made a major positive contribution to the shaping of a new political thinking well in accord with the realities of our nuclear and space era. It is appropriate to mention in this context the call by Indira Gandhi to "break the shackles of outdated thinking", which she often addressed to the countries of the world in her last years. "The world can survive and develop," she said, "only if mankind learns to feel its unity and display tolerance to political diversity."

This conclusion is obviously consonant with Lenin's

idea of the priority of the values of the whole mankind over the goals of one or another class. The significance of this idea is felt most keenly today, all the more so since the tendency towards interdependence of states in the world is obviously growing and, as was noted at the 27th Congress of the CPSU, "a contradictory but interdependent, and to a great extent integral, world is taking shape through the conflict of opposites".<sup>32</sup>

That the non-aligned movement is ready to assume its share of high responsibility for the destiny of mankind has always been appreciated in the Soviet Union. In his message of greetings to the Harare Conference Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed that the Soviet Union "treats with complete understanding the aspiration of the non-aligned countries not to take part in military blocs, to conduct an independent policy and to decide themselves the way of their development".<sup>33</sup>

By contrast with the USA, which again is trying to ignore the non-aligned movement as an indispensable factor of international relations, the Soviet Union sees in it an influential political force of our time. "We regard the non-aligned movement—however varied its participants may be—as a mighty force, confronting war and aggression, imperialism, colonialism and racism, a force that increases the capability of peace, reason and goodwill," said Mikhail Gorbachev.<sup>34</sup> Precisely this attitude to the movement gives the Soviet Union good reason to consider that, as Mikhail Gorbachev noted in October 1986, "at this turning point in world development the positive contribution made by this movement is nothing short of historic".<sup>35</sup>

The non-aligned movement is so highly appreciated in the Soviet Union because the socialist and non-aligned countries often hold similar or identical views on the main international problems of today. This has been reaffirmed in the USSR's response to the outcome of the Harare Conference.

It is believed in the Soviet Union that the Harare Appeal, just as the other documents issued at the conference, are in accord with the Soviet course towards removing the nuclear threat, setting regional conflicts in a

fair way, guaranteeing the right of nations to free and independent development, to economic development and equitable international cooperation. The USSR supports the anti-militarist and anti-imperialist decisions and actions of the non-aligned movement, and respects the independent policy of the movement as a whole and of its every member. The Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev said, "is open for cooperation and interaction with them in international affairs".<sup>36</sup> There exists an objective basis for this: their common striving for peace and progress.

\* \* \*

The analysis made in this section of the book shows that the non-aligned movement continues to be a diverse historical process and an international association in which quite contradictory trends coexist or are in conflict. The diversity and contradictoriness of the NAM increased in the complex political and economic conditions that arose at the threshold of the 1980s.

It is safe to say, however, that in the new situation, too, the anti-imperialist and centripetal trends prevail in the movement. The NAM has not abandoned its positions on issues of war and peace, on problems of completing all-round decolonization and on matters of preserving the unity of its member countries. The NAM has, on the whole, passed the test of strength and once again proved to be a steadily anti-imperialist association of non-aligned countries.

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 404.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 405.

<sup>3</sup> Fidel Castro, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>4</sup> UN A/38/132, April 8, 1983, p. 66.  
S/15675

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 113.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 69.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 64.

- <sup>8</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, pp. 530-531.
- <sup>9</sup> *Review of International Affairs*, Belgrade, Vol. XXI, No. 491, September 20, 1970, p. 22.
- <sup>10</sup> *The Times of India*, January 4, 1981, p. IV.
- <sup>11</sup> *Foreign Affairs Record*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1, January 1982, p. 12.
- <sup>12</sup> *Times*, Valletta, May 16, 1981.
- <sup>13</sup> UN A/38/132  
S/15675, April 8, 1983, p. 38.
- <sup>14</sup> *The Times*, London, February 4, 1960, p. 15.
- <sup>15</sup> V. I. Lenin, " 'Who Stands to Gain?' ", *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 53.
- <sup>16</sup> *The Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries*, p. 113.
- <sup>17</sup> V. I. Lenin, "Better Fewer, But Better", *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, 1973, p. 500.
- <sup>18</sup> V. I. Lenin, "Eighth Congress of the R.C.P. (B.). Report on the Party Programme, March 19", *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, 1977, p. 175.
- <sup>19</sup> Keesing, *Keesing's Contemporary Archives. Record Events*, Vol. XXIX (1983), No. 9, Longman, London, 1983, p. 32355.
- <sup>20</sup> UN A/38/132  
S/15675, April 8, 1983, p. 10.
- <sup>21</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, p. 533.
- <sup>22</sup> UN A/38/132  
S/15675, April 8, 1983, pp. 56=§4, 58=§13.
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 18=§48.
- <sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12=§20.
- <sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 115.
- <sup>27</sup> *United Nations. General Assembly, Security Council*, A/39/560  
UN S/16773, October 9, 1984, pp. 32-33.
- <sup>28</sup> *Moscow News*, No. 36, September 7, 1986.
- <sup>29</sup> Josip Broz Tito, *Selected Articles and Speeches*, p. 392.
- <sup>30</sup> UN A/41/617  
S/18346, September 18, 1986, pp. 3, 5.
- <sup>31</sup> At the conference, Angola and Mozambique made public some figures on the damage they incurred from South Africa's actions. In the past ten years, the Angolan President said, the country's losses due to South Africa's aggressive actions have amounted to \$12 billion. Direct damages suffered by Mozambique

from Pretoria's undeclared war against that country, have topped the 4 billion dollar mark, almost twice the figure of its foreign debt, Mozambican President said.

<sup>32</sup> *Documents and Resolutions. The 27th Congress of the CPSU*, Politizdat Publishers, Moscow, 1986, p. 100 (in Russian).

<sup>33</sup> *Moscow News*, No. 36, September 7, 1986.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> *Pravda*, October 9, 1986.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

## **Conclusion**

In September 1986, the non-aligned movement marked simultaneously its 25th and 40th anniversaries.

If the movement is viewed as a historical process, as an international ideological and political trend which originated in and spread from India after the memorable speech made by Jawaharlal Nehru on September 7, 1946, then it is 40 years old. But if we consider that it was born on September 1-6, 1961, when the first conference of non-aligned countries was convened in Belgrade, later to become the supreme organ of the NAM as an international association of these countries, then the movement is 15 years younger. Hence its 25th anniversary.

But whatever the way you count its age, the non-aligned movement today, its name remaining unchanged, is not what it used to be way back in the 1950s and 1960s. One cannot enter the same river twice, as the Ancient Greek philosopher Heraclitus said, for fresh waters flow in the river as one enters it the second time.

The non-aligned movement cannot, and of course will not, stand still. The last decades of the century have seen increased dangers for the world and, at the same time, provided unprecedented opportunities for progress. Hence, a natural question arises: What lies ahead for the policy of non-alignment and the NAM? What role will the non-aligned countries play in shaping a social and political future of mankind?

The author hopes that the analysis of objective factors and tendencies made in his book will help the reader to answer these serious questions without overestimating or underestimating the present situation and the more probable prospects. And a well-balanced realistic approach

should take into account the fact that the non-aligned movement, which strives to act as an independent political force in the world arena, is a practical movement of ordinary people, and not a fantastic ideal. It is not at all a plain sailing. It is a most complex and multifaceted phenomenon in the history of international relations, and its prospects do not fit into ready patterns. Therefore only the main features of its future can be rather clearly outlined.

This forecasting is possible because the unifying tendencies in the Third World have one specific feature which is most instrumental for determining possible directions of the policy which will be followed by most of the NAM members. Namely, the large number of the non-aligned countries and their common striving for consensus for the sake of unity constitute the factor which normally makes the common political line little dependent on, or altogether independent of, a sharp turn in the policy of some country or a small group of countries. This feature of the NAM makes it easier to forecast the common position of the majority of the non-aligned countries in international affairs than the position of any one of them.

Consequently, the non-aligned movement as a whole, as part of the world system of international relations, cannot go against the general march of history. Continuing the analogy with a river, one may assert that, despite the obvious changes in the river of international life, and in the non-aligned movement for that matter, its main course remains unchanged because "international cooperation [becomes] increasingly indispensable and ever more possible; yet the States and Nations comprising the present international community are still separated by political, economic and racial barriers. These barriers divided countries into developed and the developing, oppressors and the oppressed, the aggressors and the victims of aggression, into those who act from positions of strength, either military or economic, and those who are forced to live in the shadow of permanent danger of covert and overt assaults on their independence and security."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Two Decades of Non-Alignment. Documents*, pp. 45-46.

This is not a subjective view of the author. It is a conclusion made by the non-aligned countries themselves at their Lusaka Summit Conference in 1970, which remains valid today. This conclusion is an expression of a correct political approach to the world today, the world which consists not merely of the "rich North" and the "poor South", of blocs, great powers and smaller countries, but of the exploiters and the exploited, the robbers and the robbed, of aggressive states and peace-loving nations. With this understanding of the world, all talk of "genuine non-alignment", without allies and enemies, becomes groundless, and the direction of non-alignment is predetermined for many years to come.

But what can this direction be like? The non-aligned countries themselves and their meetings give a quite unambiguous answer to this question at least because they always speak of their struggle "for" or "against" something. And, as we all know, there can be no struggle against nothing. There is an enemy in any struggle and it must be fought against.

The reference here is not just to abstract notions of "war", "colonialism", "racism", "neocolonialism", "backwardness", and so on, but to quite real culprits—the imperialist powers and monopolies which by their social nature cannot help pursuing a policy of aggression, subjugation and plunder. They were, and will remain, the enemies of the non-aligned countries striving for peace, equality and development—this is something these countries are convinced of, and not by someone else but by their own experience. This experience and also the imperialists themselves, who by their actions constantly expose themselves and their aggressive and exploiter nature, were and will be the best "teachers" of the non-aligned countries.

Therefore in the historical perspective the anti-imperialism of the NAM cannot disappear so long as the movement yearns for full equality, self-determination and advancement. The laws governing social development, which operate objectively, independently of the wish of individuals, as, for instance, the laws governing the development of the foreign policy of states, also operate



with regard to the non-aligned states. And these operating laws will continue to bring these countries in conflict with imperialism.

It would be wrong, however, to give a one-sided picture of the NAM's future. The conflict of the anti-imperialist and "equidistant", centripetal and centrifugal, tendencies in its ranks will evidently continue. Meanwhile, the United States and other imperialist powers will not, of course, give up political and ideological subversion in the non-aligned countries and in their association. One cannot expect the gambling on "genuine non-alignment" to end by itself. Encouraged by the West, it will continue to influence the policy of non-alignment and the activity of the NAM. Briefly speaking, the struggle within and around the non-aligned movement over its character and orientation may grow acute. Possibly, this will decide the NAM's fate.

Apart from anything else, there always arise acute organizational problems related to the future of the movement as an institution in the system of international relations, the sorest of them being, perhaps, the issue concerning fulfilment of adopted decisions on its further institutionalization, the attitude to the NAM countries which ignore the criteria of membership in the movement and the decisions of its meetings and even join plans and actions of the imperialists.

Serious problems also arise with the setting up of sub-regional military-political miniblocs of non-aligned countries, whose orientations are yet to be decided. The failure of the NAM's attempts to achieve a peaceful settlement of armed conflicts between non-aligned countries calls in question its possibilities in this area of activity. The joining of the movement by more developed countries of Latin America gives rise to new problems of unity. As it has reached Oceania, there emerge problems of the movement's activities in this region of the Pacific. In a longer perspective, there may be problems involved in possible effects of the growing international authority of the NAM and non-alignment ideas in the political and public quarters of Greece, Spain, Japan and other countries.

It would be wrong, however, to judge about the distant future of a historical process by merely one of its stages. Considering, for instance, the recent conduct of the "equidistant" countries, and some confusion and vacillation within the NAM caused by the impact of the war threat and economic difficulties, it might seem that the anti-imperialism and unity of the non-aligned countries have sunk into oblivion. But such an impression would be superficial and wrong.

The point is that the development of the anti-war and anti-imperialist solidarity and cooperation of the non-aligned countries is a long process with its ups and downs. But during any period of decline, a potential is built up for a fresh upswing, and this does not depend on the wish of governments. It is a law-governed historical process whose evolution is dictated by objective causes and needs.

If one removes the scum of political passions erupting in the newly-free states today over questions related to a possibility of "equidistance" or "genuine non-alignment", one will be able to see the deep-going trends which inevitably lead these countries towards stepping up the struggle for peace, against imperialism and neo-colonialism and, on that basis, towards greater unity. Therefore, attempts to "persuade" the imperialist powers and monopolies to meet the fair political and economic demands of the developing countries are bound to fail, for the imperialists and colonialists never surrender of their own free will. So the only way for the newly-free countries to overwhelm that mighty force is to close their ranks and fight imperialism together with fresh vigour. Only acting together can they expect to solve the vital problems confronting them—the problems of peace, security, economic decolonization, and establishment of a new international economic order. In our age of big coalitions they would not be able to attain their goals singlehanded.

True, world tensions and the recent economic crisis have cut short the natural period of transition from the state of euphoria, in which many young states have been for quite a long time after the winning of indepen-

dence, to sobering up, to political maturity and a realistic assessment of their potentialities. As a result, imperialism is now fought by them with greater awareness of the strong and weak points in themselves and in the enemy. This struggle is acquiring a new dimension, seeking new ways; and the hit-and-run attacks gave way to a long siege. But this does not mean that violent anti-imperialist eruptions are impossible at this stage, and Iran and Nicaragua are recent examples of this.

It can be stated already today that increased world tensions, the growing threat of war, the decline in the economic conditions of the developing countries, and the mounting resistance put up by the colonialists and racists induce the NAM to step up its struggle for peace and advancement. In these difficult conditions, the nodal points in its activity are anti-imperialism and the struggle for the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, for a peaceful coexistence of nations. "In the face of the nuclear tragedy threatening us," Fidel Castro said at the Delhi Conference, "the drama of underdevelopment and exploitation and the economic and social crisis, there is no place for resignation or compromise. The only worthy choice is to fight."

The universal political activity of the group of non-aligned and other developing countries united in the NAM and the Group of 77 lead some scholars to the conclusion that these countries have already formed a special system, or a subsystem, of international relations. But we think it is too early to draw such a conclusion.

To be a special system, or even a subsystem, of international relations, any group of countries should have not only a common historical fate, social conditions and political interests and goals, but also a common material basis in the form of well-functioning trade, economic, financial, technical and other ties. So far, the NAM lacks such ties. At present, the community, or proximity, of political positions and actions does not yet have such an economic foundation. Despite the great efforts to develop collective self-reliance, the NAM is not yet cemented by broad and sound economic ties among its members. Such ties only begin to grow, and it will take

many years to develop them to an adequate level. This, of course, limited, and will limit for a long time to come, the possibilities for political solidarity among the NAM countries, not to mention the establishment of a system of international relations of their own.

It would be wrong, however, to forecast the future of the non-aligned countries' policy proceeding from the fact that most of them are still firmly tied economically to the West and to the world capitalist economy. Under colonial regimes the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America were still more dependent on the West, but this did not hamper the growth of the national liberation movement. On the contrary, it stimulated that growth. There is no reason to believe, however, that financial bondage, into which the non-aligned countries have fallen due to their relations with the West, will fetter them for good, making them give up the idea of independent policies and turn to whisper in voicing their demands on the imperialist powers. The historical need for economic decolonization, for restructuring international economic relations on fair and democratic principles, will continue to have a revolutionizing effect on the policy pursued by the young non-aligned states and on the activity of their association.

The non-aligned countries do have real possibilities to protect and satisfy their vital interests.

It is safe to state already now that the political role of the non-aligned countries taken together is comparable with the role played by major world forces of our time. Acting as the political vanguard of all newly independent countries, the NAM has won recognition as a major factor in the international arena. It greatly contributes to the improvement of the international climate and to the struggle for equitable political and economic relations, for social and economic progress.

However, the objective course of events confirms that the NAM, for all its activity and influence, is unable alone to force the imperialist powers and monopolies to retreat. Its chances are small here, unless it enlists the support of other anti-imperialist forces in the world. The freedom- and peace-loving non-aligned countries cannot avoid

answering the question of who their enemy is. Similarly, they cannot avoid deciding who their friend is in this world. The choice is not very big, in fact. Among the few forces of world significance they have more interests in common with the socialist community, which is the chief adversary of their enemy—imperialism. At any rate, this is what history tells us. And history is a strict teacher whose lessons one must not forget.

No references to “genuine non-alignment” or “equidistance” will hide the fact that, objectively, the union of the non-aligned and socialist countries has long since been in existence, just as the irreconcilable antagonism between the non-aligned countries and the imperialist powers has been there for a long time. Significant in this connection is the statement US permanent representative to the United Nations Vernon Walters made in an interview to CBS on October 23, 1985: “The so-called non-aligned movement is not non-aligned. The non-aligned movement votes 82-point-86.2% of the time with the Soviet Union.” But the voting in the UN is not the main thing, of course. The imperialists are maddened to see that the non-aligned countries defending their interests at the United Nations and outside it refuse to subscribe to imperialist global policies. And precisely this is genuine non-alignment which the West does not want to put up with.

The solidarity of the socialist and non-aligned countries rests on a sound foundation—the community or proximity of their international interests. The imperialist forces, which look upon the NAM as the weak link in the chain uniting the forces of peace and progress, will continue their attempts to break the weak link and sap the foundation of solidarity. But all their efforts cannot remove the objective necessity for the NAM’s interaction with the socialist community. This historical necessity is a guarantee that the paths of the socialist and non-aligned countries will not diverge in their joint struggle for peace, freedom and progress, whoever might try to push the NAM away from its time-tested positions.

<sup>1</sup> As for the Soviet Union, it has been invariably positive towards the non-aligned movement. It has always confirmed

its solidarity with the anti-war and anti-imperialist struggle of the non-aligned countries by word and deed. This stance has been recorded in the CPSU Programme: "The CPSU regards with understanding the goals and activities of the non-aligned movement and stands for an enhancement of its role in world politics. The USSR will continue to be on the side of the non-aligned states in their struggle against the forces of aggression and hegemonism and for settling disputes and conflicts that arise through negotiations, and will be opposed to the involvement of these states in military and political groupings." There can be no doubt that the Soviet Union will consistently adhere to this position in its foreign policy.

In the 1980s, mankind has found itself at the crossroads, one road leading to peaceful coexistence and development, and the other to nuclear catastrophe and non-existence. And now, at this sharp turn of history, the choice of the road depends on each peace-loving country, however small it may be. "One should not just sit on the fence—one must assume a stand." These words by Mikhail Gorbachev reflect the main condition for the maintenance of peace and security and, therefore, for an effective solution of all problems confronting mankind, including problems facing the non-aligned countries.

The NAM, being a major international association enjoying great influence in the world, bears great responsibility for the future of international relations. It can contribute still more to the common struggle waged by the peace forces for the prevention of nuclear war, for curbing the arms race, and against any encroachments of imperialism on the freedom and independence of nations. In the final analysis, the surest way to further increasing the NAM's weight in the balance of world forces and to effectively solving the main problems of our time, is to build up its solidarity with the socialist community, with all the anti-imperialist forces of peace and progress.

## **REQUEST TO READERS**

**Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.**

**Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.**

**The Non-Aligned Movement is a new and unique phenomenon in the system of international relations, which is still a puzzle to many people. Disputes often arise around the movement and even within its ranks. The questions asked are seemingly simple: What is the non-aligned movement? How old is it? With whom does it not align itself and why? Who are its friends and enemies? What role does it play in the world arena? Why does it enjoy international prestige? How does the movement develop organizationally? In his book Yuri Alimov attempts to give answers to these and other questions.**



**Progress Publishers  
Moscow**